

# **For Reference**


---

**NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**

Ex LIBRIS  
UNIVERSITATIS  
ALBERTAENSIS







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/Sullivan1971>





THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
PREDICTORS OF TEACHER MOBILITY AND TURNOVER IN ALBERTA

by



KEITH CHARLES SULLIVAN

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1971



## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare characteristics of mobile and turnover teachers with characteristics of non-mobile teachers in an attempt to identify predictors of turnover and mobility among teachers.

Data for the present study were taken from questionnaires completed by Alberta teachers in May, 1969, as part of a study directed by Ratsoy for the Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies. The sample consisted of 2,098 full-time Alberta teachers classified into four mobility types.

The four mobility types classified teachers as: those who would teach for another year in their present school, those who were planning to teach in another school in Alberta, those who were planning to teach in another school outside of Alberta, or those who were planning to leave the profession for another occupation.

The statistical treatment of data included calculation of percentage frequencies and medians, and such tests as One-way Analysis of Variance and Scheffe.

The four mobility categories were compared on nine personal, professional and situational characteristics. Scales were used to measure the degree of subject misassignment, instructional load and working conditions of the four mobility types.

From the results of the analyses, variables which seemed to be predictive of male and female teacher mobility were: place of



earliest teacher certification, salary, years of experience in present school, and type of administrative unit. Amount of academic and profession preparation, and length of full-time experience in education seemed to be predictive of female mobility but not of male mobility. The size of school variable seemed to be predictive of male mobility but not of female mobility.

Teachers assigned to their subject preference seemed to remain in their present schools. Teachers not assigned to their subject preference had a greater tendency than the others to leave the teaching profession. Assignment according to teacher subject specialization, and according to a combination of specialization and preference, did not seem to be predictive of teacher mobility.

Male teachers generally appeared to have heavier instructional loads than females. However, instructional load did not seem to be a predictor of teacher mobility.

Teachers with good working conditions in their schools were more likely to remain in these schools than teachers with less desirable working conditions. In addition, teachers deciding to leave the profession seemed to have poorer working conditions than those intending to remain in it.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement is gratefully made to the Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies for supplying the data on which this thesis is based, and to the many people whose assistance contributed to the study.

Appreciation is expressed, in particular, to Dr. E.W. Ratsoy, my supervisor, for his encouragement, patience and constructive criticism throughout the writing of the thesis. In addition, recognition is due to other members of the committee, Dr. D.A. MacKay and Dr. S.C.T. Clarke, for their helpful suggestions.

Finally, and most of all, the writer wishes to express sincerest thanks and appreciation to his wife, Patricia, for her endless patience, assistance and encouragement.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER |  | PAGE |
|---------|--|------|
| 1.      | INTRODUCTION . . . . .                               | 1    |
|         | Background of the Study . . . . .                    | 1    |
|         | The Problem . . . . .                                | 2    |
|         | Statement of the Problem . . . . .                   | 2    |
|         | Sub-problem . . . . .                                | 2    |
|         | Assumption . . . . .                                 | 2    |
|         | Delimitations . . . . .                              | 3    |
|         | Limitations . . . . .                                | 3    |
|         | Definitions of Terms . . . . .                       | 4    |
|         | Mobile . . . . .                                     | 4    |
|         | Exit-provincial Mobile Teacher . . . . .             | 4    |
|         | Inner-provincial Mobile Teacher . . . . .            | 4    |
|         | Instructional Load . . . . .                         | 4    |
|         | Misassignment . . . . .                              | 5    |
|         | Non-mobile Teacher . . . . .                         | 5    |
|         | Secondary Teacher . . . . .                          | 5    |
|         | Turnover Teacher . . . . .                           | 6    |
|         | Working Conditions . . . . .                         | 6    |
|         | Significance of the Study . . . . .                  | 6    |
|         | Overview of the Thesis . . . . .                     | 9    |
|         | Summary . . . . .                                    | 10   |
| 2.      | A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON TEACHER MOBILITY . . . | 11   |



| CHAPTER   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Introduction . . . . .  | 11   |
| Academic Qualifications . . . . .                                   | 13   |
| Salary . . . . .  | 14   |
| Working Conditions and Instructional Load . . . . .                 | 17   |
| Mobility Among Male and Female Teachers . . . . .                   | 18   |
| Age and Experience . . . . .  | 20   |
| Conclusion . . . . .  | 21   |
| 3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . .                                    | 25   |
| The Questionnaire . . . . .   | 25   |
| The Sample . . . . .  | 27   |
| Misassignment Scales . . . . .                                      | 28   |
| The M-1 Scale . . . . .   | 28   |
| The M-2 Scale . . . . .   | 31   |
| Combined Misassignment Scale . . . . .                              | 33   |
| Working Conditions . . . . .  | 33   |
| Instructional Load . . . . .  | 37   |
| Professional, Personal and Situational<br>Characteristics . . . . . | 38   |
| Overview of the Analysis . . . . .                                  | 40   |
| Summary . . . . .   | 42   |
| 4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .                                   | 43   |
| Introduction . . . . .  | 43   |
| Personal Characteristics . . . . .                                  | 43   |
| Sex . . . . .   | 43   |
| Findings . . . . .  | 44   |
| Discussion . . . . .  | 44   |



| CHAPTER   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Marital Status . . . . .                          | 46   |
| Findings . . . . .                                | 46   |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 46   |
| Professional Characteristics . . . . .            | 48   |
| Academic and Professional Preparation . . . . .   | 48   |
| Findings . . . . .                                | 49   |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 49   |
| Place of Earliest Teacher Certification . . . . . | 53   |
| Findings . . . . .                                | 53   |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 56   |
| Situational Characteristics . . . . .             | 57   |
| Annual Salary . . . . .                           | 57   |
| Findings . . . . .                                | 60   |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 60   |
| School Size . . . . .                             | 62   |
| Findings . . . . .                                | 62   |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 65   |
| Present School Experience . . . . .               | 65   |
| Findings . . . . .                                | 66   |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 66   |
| Full-time Experience in Education . . . . .       | 66   |
| Findings . . . . .                                | 69   |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 69   |
| Type of Administrative Unit . . . . .             | 72   |
| Findings (male) . . . . .                         | 72   |



| CHAPTER  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Findings (female) . . . . .                                    | 74   |
| Discussion . . . . .   | 75   |
| Misassignment . . . . .  | 76   |
| Misassignment According to Subject<br>Specialization . . . . . | 77   |
| Findings . . . . .   | 77   |
| Discussion . . . . .   | 77   |
| Misassignment According to Subject<br>Preference . . . . .     | 82   |
| Findings . . . . .   | 82   |
| Discussion . . . . .   | 82   |
| Combined Misassignment . . . . .                               | 84   |
| Findings . . . . .   | 84   |
| Discussion . . . . .   | 84   |
| Instructional Load . . . . .                                   | 85   |
| Findings . . . . .   | 85   |
| Discussion . . . . .   | 86   |
| Working Conditions . . . . .                                   | 88   |
| Findings . . . . .   | 90   |
| Discussion . . . . .   | 90   |
| 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .          | 92   |
| Summary of the Problem and Research Design . . . . .           | 92   |
| Statement of the Problem . . . . .                             | 92   |
| Sub-problem . . . . .  | 92   |
| Instrumentation and Methodology . . . . .                      | 92   |
| The Sample . . . . .   | 94   |



| CHAPTER                                     | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Summary of the Findings . . . . .           | 95   |
| Sub-problem One . . . . .                   | 95   |
| Sub-problem Two . . . . .                   | 98   |
| Sub-problem Three . . . . .                 | 99   |
| Sub-problem Four . . . . .                  | 101  |
| Sub-problem Five . . . . .                  | 102  |
| Sub-problem Six . . . . .                   | 103  |
| Conclusions . . . . .                       | 103  |
| Implications . . . . .                      | 106  |
| Recommendations for Further Study . . . . . | 109  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                      | 111  |
| APPENDIX: Questionnaire . . . . .           | 114  |



# LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE |  | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 2.1   | 1964-1965 Teacher Loss in Eight Canadian<br>Provinces . . . . .  | 12   |
| 3.1   | Composition of the Teachers in the Complete<br>Sample . . . . .  | 29   |
| 3.2   | Composition of the Teachers in the Misassignment<br>Sample . . . . .   | 30   |
| 3.3   | Misassignment Scale Relating Present Teacher<br>Assignment with Teacher Subject Specialization . .   | 32   |
| 3.4   | Misassignment Scale Relating Present Teacher<br>Assignment with Teacher Subject Preference . . . .   | 34   |
| 3.5   | Misassignment Scale Relating Present Teacher<br>Assignment with Teacher Subject Preference<br>and Teacher Subject Specialization . . . . . | 34   |
| 3.6   | Working Conditions Scale . . . . .   | 36   |
| 3.7   | Instructional Load Scale . . . . .   | 39   |
| 4.1   | Percentage Distribution of Teachers by Sex and<br>Mobility . . . . .   | 45   |
| 4.2   | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers by<br>Marital Status and Mobility . . . . .   | 47   |
| 4.3   | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers<br>by Marital Status and Mobility . . . . .   | 47   |
| 4.4   | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers by<br>Academic and Professional Preparation and<br>Mobility . . . . .                             | 50   |
| 4.5   | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers<br>by Academic and Professional Preparation<br>and Mobility . . . . .                           | 51   |
| 4.6   | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers by<br>Place of Earliest Teacher Certification<br>and Mobility . . . . .                           | 54   |



| TABLE |  | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 4.7   | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers<br>by Place of Earliest Teacher Certification<br>and Mobility . . . . .               | 55   |
| 4.8   | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers by<br>Present Annual Salary and Mobility . . . . .                                      | 58   |
| 4.9   | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers<br>by Present Annual Salary and Mobility . . . . .                                    | 59   |
| 4.10  | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers<br>by Size of School and Mobility . . . . .   | 63   |
| 4.11  | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers<br>by Size of School and Mobility . . . . .   | 64   |
| 4.12  | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers by<br>Years of Full-time Experience in Their<br>Present School and Mobility . . . . .   | 67   |
| 4.13  | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers<br>by Years of Full-time Experience in Their<br>Present School and Mobility . . . . . | 68   |
| 4.14  | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers by<br>Years of Full-time Experience in Education<br>and Mobility . . . . .              | 70   |
| 4.15  | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers<br>by Years of Full-time Experience in<br>Education and Mobility . . . . .            | 71   |
| 4.16  | Percentage Distribution of Male Teachers by<br>Type of Administrative Unit and Mobility . . . . .                                | 73   |
| 4.17  | Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers by<br>Type of Administrative Unit and Mobility . . . . .                              | 73   |
| 4.18  | Subject Specialization Misassignment Scores<br>of Teachers by Mobility and Sex . . . . .   | 78   |
| 4.19  | Subject Preference Misassignment Scores of<br>Teachers by Mobility and Sex . . . . .   | 79   |
| 4.20  | Combined Misassignment Scores of Teachers<br>by Mobility and Sex . . . . .   | 80   |



| TABLE |   | PAGE |
|-------|---|------|
| 4.21  | Instructional Load Scores of Teachers by<br>Mobility and Sex . . . . .                  | 87   |
| 4.22  | Working Condition Scores of Teachers by<br>Mobility and Sex . . . . .                   | 89   |
| 5.1   | Summary of Personal, Professional and<br>Situational Characteristics . . . . .          | 96   |
| 5.2   | Summary of Misassignment, Instructional Load<br>and Working Conditions Scores . . . . . | 97   |



## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Out of every 100 teachers now teaching in the nation's public elementary and secondary schools, it is estimated that at least six will not be employed in the profession one year from now. More than nine others still in the profession, will have moved from their present schools - at least five to another school in the same school system, at least three to a different school system in the state, and at least one to a school system in another state (N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 1968:118).

Although these figures are from the N.E.A. Research Division of the United States, Alberta is in a similar situation concerning teacher mobility. A study done at the University of Alberta in 1970 (Carmack, 1970) found that the average teacher mobility in Grande Prairie, Alberta, for the years 1960 to 1964, was thirty-two percent. Although this was probably higher than the provincial average, it demonstrates that Alberta has not escaped the problem of teacher mobility.

Hughes (Thompson, 1967:156) said that a career is a "sort of running adjustment between man and the various facts of life and his professional world." The career is continuously dynamic throughout life and by looking at related factors it might be possible to analyze this running adjustment.

This study analyzed some characteristics of mobile teachers with the view to identifying some factors related to the mobility



of teachers.

The data for the study were taken from, and limited by, the questionnaires completed by Alberta teachers in May, 1969, in a survey of the Alberta teaching force undertaken for the Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies (Ratsoy, 1970).

## II. THE PROBLEM

### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to compare characteristics of mobile and turnover teachers with characteristics of non-mobile teachers in Alberta in an attempt to identify predictors of turnover and mobility among teachers.

### Sub-problem

What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to:

- (a) personal characteristics,
- (b) professional characteristics,
- (c) situational characteristics,
- (d) subject assignment,
- (e) school working conditions, and
- (f) instructional load?

## III. ASSUMPTION

The major assumption underlying the present study was that some of the reasons for teacher mobility can be found in the teacher's present school conditions.



#### IV. DELIMITATIONS

1. This study was confined to public, Department of National Defence, Federal Indian, separate and private school teachers giving all or nearly all of their time to teaching. The sample was confined to those persons who had marked the first response category of the first item in the questionnaire. This category read, "Classroom teacher, giving all or nearly all of time to classroom teaching."

2. Omitted from the study were personnel who failed to complete items 1 or 42 of the questionnaire. These items described respectively, the position of the personnel in the school and what they expected to do during the following school year, 1969-1970.

3. Only secondary teachers (grades 7 - 12) were used in the analysis which related subject misassignment to mobility and non-mobility among teachers.

#### V. LIMITATIONS

1. No attempt was made to check the validity of the teachers' answers.

2. A forced-choice instrument, such as the AACES questionnaire, has certain built in limitations. One of the more serious of these is that enough choices may not have been given to cover the entire range of responses.

3. The population included only those teachers who taught in Alberta in 1968-1969. Any generalizations, therefore, might not be applicable to other parts of the country or to other periods of time.



## VI. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Certain terms are used repeatedly throughout this study.

The definitions of these terms are given below:

Mobile. For the purpose of this study, a teacher was considered mobile if he intended, at the end of the current school year, to move from his present school system to teach in another school. The teacher was operationally defined as the respondent who marked the first or third response category in item 42 of the questionnaire (see Appendix).

Exit-provincial mobile. The exit-provincial mobile, for the purpose of this study, was the teacher who stated that he would move out of the province during the following year and that he would continue to be employed in classroom teaching. This person was operationally defined as the respondent who marked the third response category in item 42 of the questionnaire.

Inner-provincial mobile. The inner-provincial mobile was the teacher who stated that he was intending to move from one system to another system in the province and would continue to be employed in classroom teaching. For the purpose of this study, this person was operationally defined as the respondent who marked the first response category in item 42 of the questionnaire. This category indicated whether the respondent expected to teach in another Alberta system in the next school year.

Instructional load. The instructional load of a teacher was determined by taking into account time spent in the classroom



by the teacher and the number of pupils taught by him. Operationally, the instructional load was determined by means of a scale which used the responses from items 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the questionnaire. These items described respectively, hours per week spent in classroom teaching, enrolment of the largest class taught, enrolment of the median size class taught, and total number of different pupils taught per week.

Misassignment. In this study, three scales were used to assess the degree of subject misassignment among secondary teachers. The scales were developed by Fasano (1971). The first scale (M-1) compared the field of subject assignment with the field of teacher specialization. The second scale (M-2) compared the field of subject assignment with the field of subject preference. The third scale provided a combined score which took into account both the preparation and preference of teachers.

Non-mobile teacher. The non-mobile teacher was defined as the teacher who stated he would remain in classroom teaching within the same system for the following year. For the purpose of this study, the non-mobile teacher was operationally defined as the respondent who marked the second response category in item 42 of the questionnaire. This response category was designed to identify a teacher expecting to teach in his present school system in the next school year.

Secondary teacher. In this study, secondary teacher refers to a classroom teacher giving all or nearly all of his teaching time to classroom teaching in one or more of grades 7 to 12.



Turnover teacher. A turnover teacher is generally the teacher who leaves the teaching profession to work in another field. For the purpose of this study, the turnover teacher was operationally defined as the respondent who selected the fifth response category in item 42. This response category stated that the respondent expected to work in a non-teaching position or profession during the following school year.

Working conditions. A scale purporting to measure the adequacy or inadequacy of a teacher's working conditions was constructed for the present study. This scale took into account the availability of clerical personnel, teacher aides, advisory personnel and library and material resource centers to the teachers. Responses to items 45, 46, 47, 53, and 55 of the questionnaire which dealt respectively with the availability and use of clerical personnel, teacher aides, advisory personnel, library facilities and material resource centers were used in calculating each teacher's working conditions score.

## VII. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

School administrators are faced each year with the problem of replacing many teachers. In May, 1969, the Alberta teachers were asked, "What were you doing in March, 1968? (last year)" (Ratsoy, 1970:105). The results indicated that only 70.5 percent of the Alberta teachers were employed in their present school system in March of the previous year. Since this figure does not include



those teachers who moved from school to school in the same system, it is safe to generalize that in the province of Alberta, more than 29.5 percent of the teachers in 1969 were new to their present school.

It is generally agreed that some mobility of teachers is healthy for an education system (Orlich, 1967:452). However, when the teacher mobility is of the magnitude indicated above, a definite strain is placed on the education system. This was exemplified in an Alberta Teachers' Association report on 1968 teacher mobility in Alberta (A.T.A., 1970:1) in which the following concern was expressed:

This study revealed that teacher dissatisfaction was increasing and that beginning teachers were more dissatisfied than were more experienced members of the profession. In view of the cost of preparing teachers and the realities of teacher supply, information about mobility and supply becomes a matter of concern not only to the ATA but to the Department of Education and other organizations with an interest in education as well.

In order to gain tenure, a teacher usually must be employed in a system for more than one year. In many educational systems in the United States, tenure requires at least three years of continuous service in the same system (Orlich, 1968:11). There seems to be a general feeling, in at least some quarters, that experience in a particular school or school system is related to proficiency in that school or school system. Excessive teacher mobility could cause a loss of education to the students through a discontinuity in their curriculum. Patton (1957:18) said, "In the last analysis, it is the child that suffers when the teacher



is turned into a migrating worker because of a lack of job security."

To the taxpayer, teacher mobility means economic waste. A large amount of money must be spent on teacher recruitment and the supervision of new employees. Fisher (1963:374) found that:

The continuity of a program suffers when turnover is high. Quality in the classroom is usually not achieved in a year or two. A district known as a training ground because of high turnover has children who are being shortchanged in educational opportunities.

Teacher mobility may cost the education system phenomenal amounts in educational and monetary values. Research in this area, therefore, might reveal some characteristics which would help the administrators find at least a partial solution to the problem of excessive teacher mobility.

Educational administrators must also realize that some teachers have lost their ambition to succeed in teaching and yet still persist in holding a teaching position. In industrial research, Herzberg (1959:89) found that in addition to the employees who actually quit the job, there were many others with the same dissatisfactions who had some degree of physical or psychological withdrawal from the job. One cannot estimate the cost of such a great amount of turnover, the difficulty of obtaining personnel and the loss to organizations of having people on the staff who have quit their positions psychologically.

At present, there seems to be an excess or surplus of teachers. This would lead to questioning the relevance of a mobility study in the 1970's. Stinnet (1970:1) answers this question by writing:



Even if there were no teacher shortage there would still be need to isolate and if possible remove those conditions which cause large numbers of teachers to leave the profession after a brief period of service.

Using Herzberg's reasoning above, the factors that contribute to a teacher leaving the profession or moving from his present position may be similar to the reasons that a teacher quits psychologically. It cannot, therefore, be assumed that the presently increasing "non-mobile" attitude of teachers throughout Alberta is indicative of a vast improvement in the schools. It is more probably indicative of a lack of available teaching positions. The recent set-back in educational revenue and large numbers of graduating teachers have combined to decrease the number of vacant teaching positions in Alberta.

One of the major responsibilities of boards of education and superintendents is the selection and retention of competent teachers (Conville and Anderson, 1956:11). A province wide mobility study should identify information valuable to school systems which are interested in conditions and solutions to problems contributing to high rates of teacher mobility.

## VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

The thesis is composed of five chapters. The first chapter introduces the study, giving background information, the statement of the problem and definitions of terms. A review of the literature and research is presented in Chapter 2.

Chapter 3 deals with the design of the study and is divided into eight major sections. In the first and second sections, a



description of the questionnaire and population of the present study is given. The third, fourth and fifth sections explain, respectively, the construction of the misassignment scales, the working conditions scale and the instructional load scale. The sixth section describes the personal, professional and situational characteristics used for analysis. The seventh section describes the data analysis used in the study and the eighth section is the chapter summary.

In Chapter 4 the findings of the study are reported. The major portion of the chapter deals with the relationships found among the non-mobile, inner-provincial mobile, exit-provincial mobile and turnover teachers with respect to personal, professional and situational characteristics, subject misassignment, working conditions and instructional load.

The final chapter of the thesis summarizes the study and presents several implications of the findings and some suggestions for further related research.

## IX. SUMMARY

This chapter began with a brief introductory discussion of teacher mobility. It continued with a statement of the problem and sub-problems of the thesis, an assumption, delimitations, limitations and definitions of terms. The significance of the study as related to educational administration was explained in section VII. The chapter concluded with a brief overview of the entire thesis.



## Chapter 2

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON TEACHER MOBILITY

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Teacher mobility has been of concern to education systems for some time. As early as the nineteenth century, superintendents' reports to the United States Commissioner of Education were critical of people who remained in education for only a short time (Orlich and Craver, 1968:2). Studies have ranged from mere tabulation of data to relating mobility to such factors as a teacher's best friend's satisfaction with the teaching profession (Erickson, 1968).

The Canadian Bureau of Statistics, Education Division (1968: 62), issued the statistics shown in Table 2.1 for teacher loss in Canada in the school year 1964-1965. Of the eight provinces in the survey, Alberta was fourth highest in percent of teacher loss. The Bureau of Statistics classified teacher loss under the following headings. The numbers in parentheses are the percentages of Alberta's 2,035 teachers who left for the indicated reasons.

- (a) teaching outside the province (21)
- (b) administration position in education (5)
- (c) housekeeping (33)
- (d) other non-teaching activities or occupations (7)
- (e) further training (academic or professional) (26)
- (f) superannuation, illness or death (8)



Table 2.1  
1964-1965 TEACHER LOSS IN EIGHT  
CANADIAN PROVINCES

| Province         | Number of<br>teachers | Percent of total<br>teaching force |
|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Newfoundland     | 1,393                 | 26.0                               |
| P.E.I.           | 164                   | 14.1                               |
| Nova Scotia      | 907                   | 11.9                               |
| New Brunswick    | 931                   | 14.2                               |
| Ontario          | 6,863                 | 11.1                               |
| Manitoba         | 1,495                 | 16.7                               |
| Alberta          | 2,035                 | 13.8                               |
| British Columbia | 1,902                 | 12.8                               |



These figures indicate the number of teachers who moved to different school systems within the province. They do not, however, include the number of teachers moving from school to school in the same system.

The purpose of many mobility studies is to determine the reasons for the high rate of mobility among teachers. After the reasons have been identified, solutions are suggested to alleviate the problem of mobile teachers. As Dunn (1961:30), superintendent of schools in New Jersey said:

...When teacher turnover passes the point that can be explained by personal reasons (retirement, pregnancy, illness, a family move), the administrator had better start looking for the clues. And chances are that he will find, as we did, that there are trouble spots within his school that are sending his teachers off in search of greener pastures elsewhere.

There have been numerous studies focusing on some aspect of teacher mobility. The only conclusions on which most agree are that a number of factors are involved with the movement of teachers and that these factors are difficult to identify. However, in a comprehensive review of the literature, this writer identified some characteristics that seem to be related to the mobility of teachers. The following five sections deal with these characteristics.

## II. ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

The academic qualifications of mobile teachers seem to have followed a consistent pattern in mobility studies. Conville and Anderson (1956:11) found that the highest rate of teacher turnover occurred in the states with the lowest standards of academic



admission to teaching. High professional standards and stability in the teaching force seem to be positively related.

Low academic qualifications of teaching personnel were prevalent in Idaho, U. S. A. Idaho was one of the few states that allowed certified personnel with less than a bachelor's degree to teach in the elementary and secondary schools. Idaho also had one of the highest rates of teacher turnover in the United States (Orlich, 1967:449).

Newfoundland, as noted in Table 2.1, had the highest percentage of teacher turnover in Canada during 1965 (26 percent). This eastern province also had, in 1964, one of the lowest standards of teacher qualification in Canada. In 1964, a teacher was able to obtain a teacher's license in Newfoundland without completing a full year of university training (Lundrigan, 1966:8). Miller (1969:6) emphasized this Newfoundland situation by writing:

The low standards approach for admission to the teaching profession is a factor contributing to teachers leaving the profession. In the face of the need for more and more teachers, it has often been the policy of both governments and school boards to find enough bodies to staff all classrooms, at whatever the cost in quality. The primary and elementary schools are often staffed on the basis of 'anyone can teach these grades.' Teachers who enter the profession with very little training have only a small stake in it, and are unlikely to remain in it for long. For example, in the year 1963, sixty-one percent of all Newfoundland teachers who left the profession were Emergency Supply, and another twenty-seven percent were licensed. Thus it appears that the more preparation a teacher has received, the more likely he is to remain in the profession.

### III. SALARY

Almost all studies of teacher mobility deal with some



aspect of teachers' salary. Patton (1957:14) in an article on rural education, felt that too many teachers leave the profession for better paying jobs elsewhere. He believed that this was especially true for rural teachers. In an Idaho study, Bruce (1964:29) concluded that two of the major reasons given for teachers leaving the teaching profession entirely or leaving their present school system were "other states pay higher salaries" and "salary insufficient." In a study of the Minnesota public schools' teacher mobility, the school districts with the highest median salaries tended to hold a greater portion of their teachers (Fisher, 1963:374).

Fifty highly rated teachers from New York State were asked why they had accepted their present teaching position (Williams, 1959:66). Fifteen of the respondents gave salary as their first reason for accepting the position, twenty-two listed salary as their second reason, twelve rated it third, one rated it fourth and no one rated it fifth or sixth. Williams notes that it was evident that the teachers were not influenced as much by the minimum salaries as by the maximum possibilities, shortness of range between minimum and maximum salary and salary adjustment for graduate work.

A study of the 1965-1966 Idaho teaching force (Orlich, 1967:450) produced similar results to Williams' study. Of the teachers who cited salary as the major reason for moving, no increase was found in these teachers' reported yearly salary during the next year. The teachers' stated reasons for moving, however, indicated that the average salary was not as important as the maximum salaries available.



In a scientifically selected sample of the 1967 United States' public school teachers, approximately one teacher in five who transferred to teach in another school listed higher salary as the major reason for leaving. Men reported higher salaries more frequently than woman. The same report denoted that 5.8 percent of those who left the teaching profession gave "Improve economic benefits or improve opportunities for advancement" as the reason for doing so (N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 1968:118-126).

An interesting result was obtained from a sample of 392 teachers who taught for one year and left their Georgia teaching positions (Booth, 1967:245). The researcher, Booth, discovered that:

The low salary, a favorite excuse given in education for the teacher shortage, simply was not the deciding factor in those teachers' decisions to leave. Although 179 suggested that salaries should be raised, only thirty-three named "low salary" as the reason they left.

An Alberta Teachers' Association report (1970:2) found that in 1968 "better salary" was one of the first five most stated reasons for Alberta teachers leaving their present school system. In 1970, however, it was replaced in the top five by "more responsible position."

Herzberg (1959:82) researched job satisfaction of industrial employees. He classified factors as producing high job satisfaction for short ranges of time, high job satisfaction for long ranges of time, low job satisfaction for short ranges of time or low satisfaction for long ranges of time. He found the factor of salary appeared as frequently in the high satisfaction sequences as it did in the low job satisfaction sequences. This, however, was



only true if the totals of short and long range attitude changes were compared. It was found in the low satisfactions, that salary appeared almost three times as often in the long range as in the short range. In the high satisfaction category, salary appeared about equal in both durations. It seemed, therefore, that salary had more prominence as a job dissatisfier than as a job satisfier.

#### IV. WORKING CONDITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONAL LOAD

Working conditions are prevalent factors in many mobility studies. Class size or number of pupils taught per week, discipline problems, school size, clerical assistance available, supervision and subject misassignment may be related to the decision a teacher makes to move to another school or out of the profession entirely. Patton (1957:17) states, "Good working conditions and fair pupil loads are as important incentives as good pay."

In a study of teacher mobility in Coles County, Illinois, Conville and Anderson (1956:12) found that large and overcrowded classrooms was one of the reasons twenty-one percent of the former 190 Coles County teachers gave for leaving the schools. Other expressed reasons, related to working conditions, were: lack of physical equipment and instructional materials (17%), problems in discipline (16%), colleague relationships (15%), and difficulties with the principal (3.8%).

Idaho's problem of teacher mobility was studied and reasons instrumental in the teachers' decisions to leave were: future



outlook for improvement in working conditions too discouraging, lack of teacher aides, material and equipment, lack of time for preparing, planning and evaluating teacher activities, and too little relief from pupil contact during the day. (Bruce, 1964:29).

Williams (1959:66) in his New York research, found that the two most important aspects of working conditions were supervision and class size. Satisfactory supervision was defined as skilful instructional leadership in guiding beginning teachers and encouraging flexibility in handling curriculum. A class of thirty students seemed to be the upper limit for satisfaction of teachers.

In Orlich's study of Idaho's teacher mobility (1967:451), it was apparent that teachers moved from small to larger schools, from small to larger cities and from small to larger school districts. The United States Office of Education Turnover Survey for 1959-1960 found, as above, some inverse relationships between teacher turnover and the size of the school districts. Lower rates of turnover were found in large school districts and higher rates in small school districts (Orlich and Craver, 1968:55). The Alberta Teachers' Association (1970:2) found similar results concerning school district size and teacher mobility. A higher percentage of Alberta teachers (86%) continued with the large city boards than with the smaller divisions (81%) in 1969-1970.

#### V. MOBILITY AMONG MALE AND FEMALE TEACHERS

Orlich (1967:451) claims:



It is apparent that teacher turnover must include at least two distinct populations - male and female. The popular assumption that the teacher turnover population is composed largely of women is not valid; to report findings without subgroups tends to mask significant differences that apparently exist between sexes and age groups.

Many findings in teacher mobility studies do not represent both males and females together. Some factors seem to be more important to males than to females and vice versa.

In an extensive report, Hill (1958:9) found that the principal loss to schools is to homemaking. He found that three-quarters of the female elementary school teachers must leave, at least temporarily, in order to raise a family. Ratsoy (1970:104) also found that marriage or full-time homemaking, and maternity or child rearing were given more than any other primary reason for the most recent break in teaching service for Alberta teachers. In the 1969 study, 24.1 percent of the Alberta teachers gave either of these two reasons. This was a decided decrease from a 1958 study (Ratsoy, 1970:104) when 44.1 percent of the Alberta teaching force marked one or the other of these two as the reason for their most recent break in teaching.

Higher salary and improved working conditions exemplify the necessity for using male and female populations separately in mobility studies. In a national study in the United States (N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 1968:120), only one woman in ten who transferred, gave low salary and improved working conditions as reasons for leaving. However, when male and female responses are combined, it was found that one teacher in five gave higher salary and improved working conditions as reasons for leaving.



## VI. AGE AND EXPERIENCE

Teacher mobility studies have produced a variety of results concerning the factors of age and experience. Most of the studies, however, indicate similar trends. Teachers who are mobile, typically are young and have little experience.

In a national United States study (N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 1968:121), the age category with the most mobile teachers was 25-34, including 46.1 percent of the total. The second highest age category was 35-44, encompassing 16.4 percent of the total. An Idaho study (Orlich, 1967:449) found that female teachers who changed positions during the 1964-1965 school year were older than male teachers who changed positions. The female median age bracket was 25-29 years. In an Alberta Teachers' Association survey (1970:7), mobility was found to be somewhat inversely related to age. Approximately 25 percent of the Alberta teachers below the age of thirty were mobile, while only 12 percent of each category above thirty was mobile.

Teaching experience and age factors run approximately parallel when compared to the mobility of teachers. The younger and less experienced the teacher, the more likely is he to be mobile. In examining nearly a dozen mobility studies, the N.E.A. Research Division (1968:122) found that the greatest loss of teachers occurs in the first three to four years of teaching. In California, over a nine year period, only thirteen percent of the teachers leaving had more than ten years of experience (Orlich and



Craver, 1968:41). The Alberta Teachers' Association (1970:6) found, as with age, an inverse relationship between teaching experience and mobility. However, the teachers with one year of experience in Alberta were less mobile than those with two or three years of experience. Similar results were found in Newfoundland. Out of 1,001 teachers who left in 1964-1965, 772 (more than 75 percent) had from one to five years of experience (Nfld. Dept. of Education News Letter, 1966:8).

## VII. CONCLUSION

The review of the literature revealed that teacher mobility has been a problem for all types of school systems. A number of reports and surveys have attempted to analyze conditions which produce an undesirable amount of teacher mobility. The majority of the research, however, is concentrated on the turnover teacher, the teacher who leaves the profession. Very little has been written on the mobile teacher who moves from one school to another, or from one system to another, ~~while~~ remaining in a teaching position.

Provinces and states allowing certification of teachers with low academic qualifications seem to be troubled with a high teacher turnover. The greater the time and effort invested to become a teacher, the more reluctant the teacher seems to be to leave the profession.

Salary is important to all professions and trades. Teaching seems to be no exception. The prospect of a higher salary seems to have been one of the predominant reasons for the movement of



teachers from one school to another or out of the teaching profession altogether. The maximum possible salary seems to be of more importance to the mobile teacher than an immediate financial increase. Some recent studies indicate that salary is not the outstanding concern it was previously and is being replaced by other factors such as working conditions. Herzberg's (1959:116) industrial research concerning salary seems to be relevant to teacher mobility. He says that salary meets two types of avoidance needs of the employee. The first of these is economic deprivation and the second, which may be more prevalent for teachers, is the feeling of being treated unfairly.

Only a few studies on teacher mobility dealt with working conditions. No study found in the literature dealt with mobility related to subject misassignment, availability of clerical personnel or library facilities. However, studies which did include working conditions seemed to indicate that class size and discipline problems are related to teacher mobility.

Most mobility studies compile male and female data separately. The researchers have found that each of the sexes usually has different reasons for leaving schools. Combining the male and female data might obscure some important factors related to one of the sexes.

The characteristics of age and teaching experience are inversely related to mobility. The greatest turnover involves staff members between the ages of 21-30 with the exception of the first year teachers who are usually less mobile than teachers with two



or three years of experience. This was to be expected since an older teacher would more likely be involved, both economically and socially, in his school and community than a teacher with three to five years of experience.

Most of the literature on teacher mobility was in the form of statistical surveys. The researchers concentrated their reports on the percentage of the total teaching force, academic qualifications, age, years of experience and other similar characteristics of mobile teachers. The reasons for staff loss were usually handled with one multiple-choice type question.

These studies served an important purpose in ascertaining if and where a problem existed in teacher mobility. However, since most researchers agree there are problems in this area, perhaps a more fruitful approach would be one which concerns itself with the causes of teacher mobility.

The factors that have been identified as relating to teacher mobility are strikingly similar to Herzberg's (1959:113-115) hygiene factors. When Herzberg's respondents reported feeling happy with their jobs, they referred most frequently to success in their work and the possibility of professional growth. Feelings of unhappiness, however, seemed to be related to conditions which surround the job (hygiene factors). If the hygiene factors were improved rather than ignored, it seemed easier to encourage positive job attitudes. Supervision, interpersonal relationships, physical working conditions, salary, company policies, and administrative practices, benefits and job security are included in



Herzberg's hygiene factors. If employees found these factors at an unacceptable level, then job dissatisfaction developed. If these factors were held at an optimal level, all that could be expected would be the prevention of dissatisfaction and poor job performance, rather than an increase in satisfaction. Hygiene factors seem to be predictive of teacher mobility.



## Chapter 3

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The AACES questionnaire was distributed during the month of May, 1969 to all teachers who were employed in Public and Separate School Districts, Counties and School Divisions, Indian Schools, private schools and Department of National Defence schools in Alberta. Some questionnaires were also completed by teachers and administrators from several Junior Colleges and Agricultural Colleges and teachers in the Department of Education Correspondence School of Alberta.

There were 18,074 usable questionnaires completed and returned. The exact percentage of Alberta teachers who completed and returned the questionnaires could not be calculated as the number of teachers employed in Alberta fluctuates daily. However, at least 90 percent of teachers, actively teaching in Alberta schools at the time when questionnaires were being issued, returned a completed questionnaire.

The questionnaire was composed of fifty-nine forced-choice items. The questions dealt with personal and professional characteristics, experience, mobility and instructional practice of Alberta teachers.

Many teachers neglected to complete some items on the



questionnaire. A number of reasons may have contributed to the omissions. The extended length of the questionnaire probably discouraged a number of respondents. A number of items did not apply to the entire teaching force. The questionnaire had perforated, tear-off pages. In some cases, it was evident, that the last page or two became separated from the rest of the questionnaire.

It was, however, possible in most cases, to reconstruct the responses for items 56 (sex), 57 (marital status), 58 (salary) and 59 (age). It was impossible to reproduce the responses to items 47-55.

A copy of the questionnaire, may be found in the appendix. The number of blank responses for each item was small and remained insignificant for this study.

Reliability of the questionnaire was tested by spot checking a number of items. The questionnaire appeared, on the whole, to be very reliable (98%) with one exception. The exception was Item 4, which read: "How many HOURS PER WEEK do you spend IN CLASSROOM TEACHING? (exclude time counselling, supervising, etc.)." The data indicated that approximately eleven percent of the teachers marked this question inaccurately. Elementary teachers, in particular, seemed to have read the question as "hours per day" instead of "hours per week." The average number of hours, therefore, was lower than expected.



## II. THE SAMPLE

Only full-time teachers were selected for the present study. The sample was further delimited by Item 42 of the questionnaire, which was designed to determine the respondent's expected career plans for the next school year. It was according to this item that the study's four mobility types were categorized. Item 42 read as follows:

42. What do you expect to do in the school year 1969-1970? (next year)

1. Teach in another Alberta system
2. Teach in this system
3. Teach outside of Alberta
4. Work in education, but not as a classroom teacher
5. Work in a non-teaching position
6. Study full time in a field outside of teaching
7. Attend university full time for further training in teaching
8. Be a full-time homemaker
9. Other

If a respondent marked response 1, he was categorized as an INNER-PROVINCIAL MOBILE teacher. There were 659 full-time teachers who marked this response.

If a respondent marked response 2, he was categorized as a NON-MOBILE teacher. Over 10,000 teachers marked this response. In order to simplify data analysis, a random sample of 765 of these teachers was taken to use in the analysis.

If a respondent marked response 3, he was categorized as an EXIT-PROVINCIAL MOBILE teacher. Teachers who marked this response numbered 542.

If a respondent marked response 5, he was categorized as a



TURNOVER teacher. Full-time teachers numbering 132, marked this response.

The total sample, therefore, included 2098 full-time teachers, consisting of 659 inner-provincial mobile, 765 non-mobile, 542 exit-mobile and 132 turnover teachers. See Table 3.1. This sample was used for all data analysis with only one exception.

The exception was in the analysis dealing with the mis-assignment of teachers. For this part of the study, the sample was further delimited to secondary school teachers only. The secondary teacher sample numbered 1,002 full-time teachers and consisted of 319 inner-provincial mobile, 342 non-mobile, 267 exit-provincial mobile and 74 turnover teachers. See Table 3.2.

### III. MISASSIGNMENT SCALES

Three scales, constructed by Rousseau and revised by Fasano (1971), were used to measure the degree of subject mis-assignment prevalent in the four types of mobile teachers included in the sample. The variables which seemed to be important were the teacher's field of specialization, field of preference and field of assignment.

#### The M-1 Scale

The M-1 scale was designed to measure the congruence between a teacher's academic specialization and his present teaching position. This information was obtained from the responses to Items 18, 21, 23, and 26 of the questionnaire. The Items were designed



Table 3.1  
COMPOSITION OF THE TEACHERS  
IN THE COMPLETE SAMPLE <sup>1</sup>

| Mobility type           | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------------------|------|--------|-------|
| Non-mobile <sup>2</sup> | 248  | 517    | 765   |
| Inner-provincial        | 231  | 428    | 659   |
| Exit-provincial         | 209  | 333    | 542   |
| Turnover                | 65   | 67     | 132   |
| Total                   | 753  | 1,345  | 2,098 |

<sup>1</sup>This sample was used for all analyses, excepting the analyses related to the misassignment of teachers.

<sup>2</sup>A random sample taken from 13,669 non-mobile teachers identified in the study.



Table 3.2  
COMPOSITION OF THE TEACHERS IN THE  
MISASSIGNMENT SAMPLE<sup>1</sup>

| Mobility type    | Male | Female | Total |
|------------------|------|--------|-------|
| Non-mobile       | 187  | 155    | 342   |
| Inner-provincial | 188  | 131    | 319   |
| Exit-provincial  | 164  | 103    | 267   |
| Turnover         | 45   | 29     | 74    |
| Total            | 584  | 418    | 1,002 |

<sup>1</sup>This sample was used only in the analysis related to misassignment of teachers and their mobility.



to obtain, respectively, the teacher's major field of subject specialization, second field of subject specialization, major assignment and second assignment during that school year.

A teacher was assigned a score of 7, the highest possible score, if his only teaching assignment was in the subject matter field of his major academic specialty. At the other end of the continuum was a teacher who only taught a subject or subjects which were not his major or second academic specialization. This type of teacher was assigned the lowest score, that is, a score of 1. Other combinations of subject assignment and academic specialization were assigned scores between 1 and 7 as shown in Table 3.3.

A high score on this scale, therefore, was indicative of a teacher being assigned in accordance with his academic training. The lower the score, the more misassigned the teacher was according to his specialization.

### The M-2 Scale

The M-2 scale was constructed to measure the congruence between a teacher's present teaching assignment and his field of preference. This scale was obtained from the responses to Items 23, 26 and 29 of the questionnaire. These Items were designed to obtain, respectively, the teachers' major and second fields of assignment during the school year and the teacher's subject preference.

A teacher was assigned a score of 4, the highest score, if his teaching preference equalled his major teaching assignment. The lowest score, that is, a score of 1, was assigned to a teacher



Table 3.3

MISASSIGNMENT SCALE RELATING PRESENT TEACHER ASSIGNMENT  
WITH TEACHER SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION  
M-1 SCALE

| Congruence of specialization<br>and present position  | Assigned<br>score |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. Major teaching assignment equals<br>major area of specialization AND                     |                   |
| a. there is no additional teaching assignment - - - -                                       | 7                 |
| OR  |                   |
| b. a second teaching assignment equals<br>a second area of specialization - - - - -         | 7                 |
| OR  |                   |
| c. a second teaching assignment does not equal<br>a second area of specialization - - - - - | 5                 |
| 2. Major teaching assignment equals second area of<br>specialization AND                    |                   |
| a. second teaching assignment in no other field - - -                                       | 6                 |
| OR  |                   |
| b. second teaching assignment in major specialization- -                                    | 6                 |
| OR  |                   |
| c. second teaching assignment in another field - - - -                                      | 4                 |
| 3. Major teaching assignment not in the major or<br>second teaching specialty AND           |                   |
| a. second teaching assignment in major specialty - - -                                      | 3                 |
| OR  |                   |
| b. second teaching assignment in second specialty - -                                       | 3                 |
| OR  |                   |
| c. second teaching assignment not in second or<br>major specialty - - - - -                 | 1                 |



whose preference was neither his major nor second teaching assignment. Other combinations of teacher assignment and preference were allotted scores between 1 and 4 as shown in Table 3.4.

A high score on this scale, therefore, was indicative of a teacher's being well assigned in accordance with his preference. The lower the assigned score, the more misassigned was the teacher in relation to his preference.

#### Combined Misassignment Scale

The third misassignment scale, a composite of the first two, was developed to indicate the respondent's combined degree of assignment-misassignment relative to academic specialization and subject preference. See Table 3.5.

### IV. WORKING CONDITIONS

A scale was constructed to measure a teacher's working conditions in relation to the school in which he was employed. The scale was based upon the responses given to Items 45, 46, 47, 53 and 55 of the questionnaire. These items were designed to measure, respectively, the amount of use by the teacher of clerical personnel, teacher aides, consultative or advisory personnel, and the use by an entire class of a library or material resources center.

In constructing the Working Conditions Scale, the number of categories in each of the five items was collapsed. The categories in the items were reduced, with one exception, to "available" and "not available." To illustrate this better, Item 45 is given below.



Table 3.4

MISASSIGNMENT SCALE RELATING PRESENT TEACHER ASSIGNMENT  
WITH TEACHER SUBJECT PREFERENCE  
M-2 SCALE

| Congruence of preference<br>and present position                                       | Assigned<br>score |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Teaching preference equals<br>major teaching assignment AND                         |                   |
| a. there is no additional teaching assignment - - - - -                                | 4                 |
| OR   |                   |
| b. there is an additional teaching assignment - - - - -                                | 3                 |
| 2. Teaching preference equals second teaching<br>assignment - - - - -                  | 2                 |
| 3. Teaching preference does not equal major or<br>second teaching assignment - - - - - | 1                 |

Table 3.5

MISASSIGNMENT SCALE RELATING PRESENT TEACHER ASSIGNMENT  
WITH TEACHER SUBJECT PREFERENCE AND  
TEACHER SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION

|  |
|--|
| M-1 score plus M-2 score equals Combined Misassignment score |
|--|



45. What was your average use of clerical personnel in your school since September 1, 1968?

1. Less than 1 hour/week
2. 1 or 2 hours/week
3. 3 to 5 hours/week
4. 6 to 10 hours/week
5. 11 to 20 hours/week
6. 21 to 40 hours/week
7. Over 40 hours/week
8. None or N/A

In this example, responses 1 to 7 were reduced to one category of "available." Response 8 was the other category of "not available." If a respondent indicated that clerical personnel were available, he was assigned a score of two. If a respondent indicated that clerical personnel were "not available", he was assigned a score of one. Each of the other four items, on teacher aides, advisory personnel, library and material resources centers was collapsed and assigned scores in a similar manner with one exception. See Table 3.6.

The exception was Item 53 dealing with the availability of a library to an entire class during class time. This item was reduced to three categories and assigned three scores. The first category indicated "no library available" and was assigned a score of one. The second category indicated "a library available but with no person designated as librarian" and was assigned a score of two. The third category was "a library available with a person designated as librarian" and was assigned a score of three.

Finally, each teacher in the sample had a total Working Conditions score computed by addition of the assigned scores on



Table 3.6

## WORKING CONDITIONS SCALE

| Item<br>number | Response<br>category | Item and response(s)  | Assigned<br>score |
|----------------|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| 45             |                      | 1. What was your average use of<br>clerical personnel in your<br>school since September 1, 1968?  |                   |
|                | 8                    | (a) no clerical personnel available - - - - -   | 1                 |
|                | 1-7                  | (b) clerical personnel available - - - - -  | 2                 |
| 46             |                      | 2. What was your average use of<br>teacher aides since September 1, 1968?   |                   |
|                | 1 and 8              | (a) no teacher aides available - - - - -  | 1                 |
|                | 2-7                  | (b) teacher aides available - - - - -   | 2                 |
| 47             |                      | 3. What was the extent, since<br>September 1, 1968, of the<br>use of consultative or advisory<br>personnel who "specialize" in<br>the subjects you teach? |                   |
|                | 2                    | (a) no consultative or advisory personnel<br>available - - - - -  | 1                 |
|                | 3-8                  | (b) consultative or advisory personnel<br>available - - - - -   | 2                 |
| 53             |                      | 4. Does your school have a library<br>available to an entire class during<br>class time?  |                   |
|                | 5                    | (a) no library available - - - - -  | 1                 |
|                | 4                    | (b) a library available, but with<br>no person designated as librarian - - -  | 2                 |
|                | 1-3                  | (c) a library available with a person<br>designated as librarian - - - - -  | 3                 |
| 55             |                      | 5. How many times since September 1,<br>1968, have you scheduled class<br>activities in the material resources<br>center (not library)?                   |                   |
|                | 3                    | (a) no resource center available - - - - -  | 1                 |
|                | 2 and 4-8            | (b) resource center available - - - - -   | 2                 |



each of the five items. The highest possible score was eleven. This indicated that the teacher had excellent working conditions in relation to the five areas covered by the items. The scores ranged down to five, the lowest possible score, which indicated poor working conditions in relation to the areas covered by the five items. The four mobility categories in the sample were compared according to the scores obtained on the Working Conditions Scale.

## V. INSTRUCTIONAL LOAD

The variables that seemed to be significant in dealing with the instructional load of teachers were: hours spent per week in classroom teaching, enrolment of the largest class taught by the teacher, enrolment of the median-sized class taught by the teacher and total number of different pupils taught in a week by the teacher. Therefore, Items 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the questionnaire, which were designed to obtain this information, were used to develop an Instructional Load Scale.

The item responses were collapsed in order to make the categories more distinctive and each new category was assigned a score. A low score indicated a smaller instructional load than did a high score. Item 5 is given below as an example.

5. What is the enrolment of the largest class that you teach?  
If you supervise some pupils while teaching others, consider a class to be the total number of pupils for whom you have sole charge in your room at any one time.
  1. Under 10
  2. 11 to 15
  3. 16 to 20



4. 21 to 25
5. 26 to 30
6. 31 to 35
7. 36 to 40
8. 41 to 45
9. Over 45

This Item was collapsed so that responses 1 and 2 were assigned a score of one, responses 3 and 4 were assigned a score of two, responses 5 and 6 were assigned a score of three, responses 7 and 8 were assigned a score of four, and response 9 was assigned a score of five. Items 4, 6 and 7 were categorized and assigned scores in a similar manner to Item 5. See Table 3.7.

The Instructional Load score was obtained for each teacher by the addition of the assigned scores for each of the four Items. The highest score possible, which was 20, indicated a heavy instructional load for the teacher during the school year. The scores then ranged down to 5, the lowest possible score, which denoted a much lighter instructional load. The Instructional Load scores were then used to compare the instructional loads of the four mobility groups.

## VI. PROFESSIONAL, PERSONAL AND SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Nine personal, professional and situational characteristics, which, according to the literature, seemed to be related to teacher mobility, were chosen from the questionnaire. The personal characteristics chosen were sex and marital status. The professional characteristics chosen were academic and professional preparation, and place of earliest teacher certification. The situational



Table 3.7

## INSTRUCTIONAL LOAD SCALE

| Item number | Response number | Item and response(s)  | Assigned score |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----------------|
| 4           |                 | 1. How many HOURS PER WEEK do you spend in CLASSROOM TEACHING?            |                |
|             | 5               | (a) over 10 to 15 hours - - - - -   | 1              |
|             | 6               | (b) over 15 to 20 hours - - - - -   | 2              |
|             | 7               | (c) over 20 to 25 hours - - - - -   | 3              |
|             | 8               | (d) over 25 to 30 hours - - - - -   | 4              |
|             | 9               | (e) over 30 hours - - - - -   | 5              |
| 5           |                 | 2. What is the ENROLMENT of the LARGEST CLASS that you teach?             |                |
|             | 1 and 2         | (a) under 15 - - - - -  | 1              |
|             | 3 and 4         | (b) 16 to 25 - - - - -  | 2              |
|             | 5 and 6         | (c) 26 to 35 - - - - -  | 3              |
|             | 7 and 8         | (d) 36 to 45 - - - - -  | 4              |
|             | 9               | (e) over 45 - - - - -   | 5              |
| 6           |                 | 3. What is the ENROLMENT of the MEDIAN-SIZED CLASS that you teach?        |                |
|             | 1 and 2         | (a) under fifteen - - - - -   | 1              |
|             | 3 and 4         | (b) 16 to 25 - - - - -  | 2              |
|             | 5 and 6         | (c) 26 to 35 - - - - -  | 3              |
|             | 7 and 8         | (d) 36 to 45 - - - - -  | 4              |
|             | 9               | (e) over 45 - - - - -   | 5              |
| 7           |                 | 4. What is the total number of DIFFERENT PUPILS that you teach in a week? |                |
|             | 1 and 2         | (a) under 40 pupils - - - - -   | 1              |
|             | 3 and 4         | (b) 40 to 99 pupils - - - - -   | 2              |
|             | 5 and 6         | (c) 100 to 199 pupils - - - - -   | 3              |
|             | 7 and 8         | (d) 200 to 399 pupils - - - - -   | 4              |
|             | 9               | (e) 400 or more pupils - - - - -  | 5              |



characteristics chosen were annual salary, school size, present school experience, full-time experience in education and type of administration unit. Percentage distributions of these nine characteristics were compared in relation to each of the four mobility types.

## VII. OVERVIEW OF THE ANALYSIS

The original data from the questionnaire had been stored on computer tape. The data used in this study were transferred to a second computer tape. Misassignment, Instructional Load and Working Condition scores were then computed and the information stored on computer disk. These two sources of data were then used in the analysis.

A complete printout of data on each of the mobility groups was obtained, giving all of the data for the fifty-nine items on the questionnaire plus the Instructional Load, Working Conditions and Misassignment scores. Randomly selected responses were then checked from the printout to see whether Instructional Load, Working Conditions and Misassignment scores had been computed accurately. All were found to be correct.

Pearson product-moment correlations were used to determine the relationships between the personal, professional and situational characteristics of the teachers in each of the four mobility categories. As Ferguson (1966:127) stated:

Thus  $r^2$  can quite meaningfully be interpreted as a proportion and  $r^2 \times 100$  as a percent. In general, in attempting to conceptualize the degree of relationship represented by a correlation coefficient it is more meaningful to think in terms



of the square of the correlation coefficient instead of the correlation coefficient itself.

A coefficient of .70 was chosen, by the writer, as the minimum correlation acceptable for predicting one variable from another. This level allowed a prediction, of one variable from the other, with an accuracy of 49 percent. It was felt that a 49 percent prediction of one variable from another warranted dropping one of the variables from the study.

Percentage frequencies for the personal, professional and situational characteristics within each of the four mobility groups were calculated. Medians were calculated for the characteristics with ordinal properties as suggested by Ferguson (1966: 57). Only percentage distributions were calculated for characteristics with nominal properties.

The differences among the four mobility groups with respect to the Misassignment, Working Conditions and Instructional Load variables were analyzed as follows: (1) Misassignment, Working Conditions and Instructional Load scores for the four mobility groups were calculated, (2) comparison between the means of the groups was made using the Analysis of Variance Technique as proposed by Ferguson (1966:281-295). The a priori level of significance for accepting differences in the means was set at the .05 level of confidence. The Scheffe Test for Multiple Comparison of Means was applied to identify any significant differences between pairs of groups following a significant F ratio. As before, the level of significance was set at .05. If differences between mobility group pairs fell at or below this level of confidence, the two



means were assumed to be significantly different.

#### VIII. SUMMARY

This chapter explained the design of the study. It commenced with a discussion of the questionnaire and description of the study sample. The design and method of calculation of the Misassignment, Working Conditions and Instructional Load scales and scores was discussed in sections III to VI. The chapter concluded with a listing of the professional, personal and situational characteristics used in the study and an overview of the data analysis.



## Chapter 4

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of the analyses relevant to the problem of the study. The chapter is divided into sections dealing with variables which seemed to be predictive of mobility among teachers, as suggested by the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. The second, third and fourth sections present the findings and discussions of the personal, professional and situational characteristics, respectively. The fifth, sixth and seventh sections deal, respectively, with the findings and discussions of the Misassignment, Instructional Load and Working Conditions scores.

The literature, reviewed in Chapter 2, strongly suggested that to present findings without taking into account the sex of the respondents, might tend to mask significant differences. For this reason, separate analyses were carried out for each of the sexes and the findings reported by sex as well as by mobility groups.

#### II. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The personal characteristics chosen for analysis were sex and marital status.

##### Sex

Percentage distributions of the teachers in the sample



were prepared and comparisons among the four mobility groups made by sex within each of the mobility groups.

Findings. The percentage distributions given in Table 4.1 indicates that a greater percentage of female teachers than male teachers was found in each of the four mobility groups. The largest percentage of females was in the non-mobile group (67.7%). The inner-provincial and exit-provincial groups had the second (64.6%) and third (61.2%) highest percentage of female teachers. The turnover teachers, with almost an equal distribution between the two sexes, had the smallest percentage of females.

Discussion. Many educators have the idea, as discussed in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, that most of the mobility problem in education is the result of women leaving teaching because of pregnancy or homemaking. An examination of the responses to item 42, revealed that only 3.3 percent of Alberta teachers were leaving because of homemaking reasons. The inner-provincial mobile, exit-provincial mobile and turnover teachers accounted for 9.3 percent of the total Alberta teaching force. The results of this study indicated that over 50 percent of these mobile categories, or over 4.7 percent of the total teaching force, were females. Therefore, while 3.3 percent of the total teaching force left for homemaking reasons, over 4.7 percent of the total Alberta teaching force that left their school for another teaching position or job outside of education were female. This seems to discredit the statement that most of the mobility problem in



Table 4.1

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY  
SEX AND MOBILITY

| Sex    | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|--------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Female | 67.7%          | 64.6%                | 61.2%               | 52.3%    | 64.1% |
| Male   | 32.3           | 35.4                 | 38.8                | 47.7     | 35.9  |



education is the result of women leaving teaching because of pregnancy or homemaking.

### Marital Status

Separate distributions for male and female teachers, according to the teachers' marital status, were prepared for the four mobility groups. The results are reported in Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

Findings. The data for the male teachers indicated that proportionally more teachers in the non-mobile category were married, widowed or divorced (80.5%) than in any of the other three categories. The percentages of married, widowed or divorced teachers in the inner-provincial, exit-provincial and turnover categories were 73.7, 75.5 and 73.3, respectively.

The female teachers' data indicated similar percentages. The female non-mobile category had 80.0 percent of the teachers married, widowed or divorced. The percentage of married, widowed or divorced teachers in the inner-provincial, exit-provincial and turnover categories was 51.7, 34.8 and 50.0, respectively.

Discussion. The results of the analysis on the male teachers' sample were no surprise. It was expected that a greater proportion of non-mobile teachers would be married than any of the other mobility categories. The married male teacher, especially if he has a home and children, is usually more content with his present school and community than a single male teacher. He would



Table 4.2

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS  
BY MARITAL STATUS AND MOBILITY

| Marital<br>status                   | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Married,<br>widowed and<br>divorced | 80.5%          | 73.7%                | 75.5%               | 73.3%    | 75.7% |
| Single and R.C.<br>religious order  | 19.5           | 26.3                 | 24.5                | 26.7     | 24.3  |

Table 4.3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS  
BY MARITAL STATUS AND MOBILITY

| Marital<br>status                   | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Married,<br>widowed and<br>divorced | 80.0%          | 51.7%                | 34.8%               | 50.0%    | 54.1% |
| Single and R.C.<br>religious order  | 20.0           | 48.3                 | 65.2                | 50.0     | 45.9  |



be more reluctant than the single teacher to leave his present community because of school problems. However, for the male teachers, the differences between the four mobility categories were slight.

The differences between the "married" and "single" categories were more accentuated in the female percentage distribution. The large percentage of teachers in the inner-provincial category who were single or belonged to a religious order may have been caused by young graduates not having the opportunity to be employed in the teaching position they prefer. Therefore, they accept another position hoping to move after a few years.

The large percentage of single teachers in the female exit-provincial category may have been a result of young single women wishing to teach in another province or country before settling down to married life.

An overview of the personal characteristic, marital status, seemed to indicate a relevance to teacher mobility. It seems that mobility in education is more prevalent among single than married teachers.

### III. PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The professional characteristics chosen for analysis were academic and professional preparation, and place of earliest teacher certification.

#### Academic and Professional Preparation

Separate male and female percentage distributions for the



variable of academic and professional preparation were prepared for each of the four mobility types. The results are given in Tables 4.4 and 4.5.

Findings. The male medians on academic and professional preparation proved to be almost identical for all four mobility categories. The medians calculated for non-mobile and exit-provincial mobile teachers were each 4.4 years. The turnover and inner-provincial mobile medians were slightly lower at 4.3 and 4.2 years, respectively.

The female medians for academic and professional preparation ranged from 2.6 to 3.5 years. All female medians were lower than male medians. The rank order of the medians for the mobility groups produced an unexpected result. The highest median appeared in the exit-provincial mobile group. This median was closely followed, respectively, by the medians for the turnover (3.2) and inner-provincial mobile (3.0) categories. The lowest female median belonged to the non-mobile teachers.

Discussion. There are two schools of thought concerning academic and professional preparation of mobile teachers. The first argues that the lower academically and professionally qualified teachers have the least commitment to teaching and, therefore, move in and out of the profession. The second viewpoint suggests that the lower academically and professionally qualified teachers hold on to their present positions in fear of losing their positions to better qualified teachers. The better qualified teachers,



Table 4.4

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS BY  
ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION  
AND MOBILITY

| Academic and<br>professional<br>preparation | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Less than 1<br>year                         | 0.8%           | 1.3%                 | 0.0%                | 3.2%     | 1.3%  |
| 1 complete<br>year                          | 2.0            | 1.3                  | 0.5                 | 3.2      | 1.8   |
| 2 years but<br>less than 3                  | 10.4           | 7.8                  | 11.1                | 12.9     | 10.6  |
| 3 years but<br>less than 4                  | 14.0           | 17.8                 | 15.9                | 9.7      | 14.4  |
| 4 years but<br>less than 5                  | 43.2           | 47.0                 | 43.5                | 48.4     | 45.4  |
| 5 years but<br>less than 6                  | 19.6           | 16.1                 | 18.8                | 14.5     | 17.2  |
| 6 or more<br>complete years                 | 10.0           | 8.7                  | 10.2                | 8.1      | 9.3   |
| Median                                      | 4.4<br>years   | 4.2                  | 4.4                 | 4.3      | 4.3   |



Table 4.5

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS BY  
ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION  
AND MOBILITY

| Academic and<br>professional<br>preparation | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Less than 1<br>year                         | 1.2%           | 1.4%                 | 0.3%                | 5.9%     | 2.2%  |
| 1 complete<br>year                          | 30.2           | 10.9                 | 7.9                 | 14.7     | 15.9  |
| 2 years but<br>less than 3                  | 27.5           | 36.7                 | 27.8                | 26.5     | 29.6  |
| 3 years but<br>less than 4                  | 10.8           | 19.7                 | 22.4                | 10.3     | 15.8  |
| 4 years but<br>less than 5                  | 22.1           | 26.0                 | 32.0                | 27.9     | 27.0  |
| 5 years but<br>less than 6                  | 4.5            | 4.1                  | 7.6                 | 11.8     | 7.0   |
| 6 or more<br>complete years                 | 3.7            | 1.2                  | 2.0                 | 2.9      | 2.5   |
| Median                                      | 2.6<br>years   | 3.0                  | 3.5                 | 3.2      | 3.1   |



according to this school of thought, are more secure and move out of their present school more often than teachers with poor qualifications.

The second viewpoint seemed to provide the more plausible explanation for the differences identified in the female sample. The exit-provincial mobiles had the highest academic and professional preparation, followed closely by turnover teachers and inner-provincial mobile teachers. The non-mobile teachers were the least academically and professionally prepared. Therefore, those teachers who did not move were generally much less well prepared, academically and professionally, than those teachers who were mobile.

The male distribution by academic and professional preparation was surprising. The four medians were quite similar, suggesting that neither of the above explanations was relevant in the case of the male sample. The amount of academic and professional training, therefore, was apparently not related to male mobility.

Marital status may have been an important variable affecting the amount of academic and professional preparation of female teachers. As indicated in Table 4.3, a greater percentage of non-mobile female teachers were married than were female teachers in any of the other three mobility categories. A married female teacher, especially if she has children, probably cannot afford the time or money for extra courses as much as a single female. This may account for the other three mobility categories of female teachers having more academic and professional preparation than the non-mobile category.



Females, generally, did not seem to acquire as much education as the males. Possibly, many female teachers anticipating marriage and housekeeping duties a few years after graduation, did not wish to make too large an investment in their education.

#### Place of Earliest Teacher Certification

Separate distributions for male and female teachers, according to the teachers' places of earliest teacher certification, were prepared for the four mobility groups. The results are reported in Tables 4.6 and 4.7.

Findings. The male and female distributions, while differing in percentages, were similar in the ranking of these percentages within mobility categories. For this reason, the male and female findings are reported together in this section.

The Alberta certified teachers were approximately equally distributed among three of the mobility categories. Only the exit-provincial mobiles had a significantly different distribution. The proportion of Alberta exit-provincial mobiles was approximately one-half that of teachers found in the other three categories. However, Alberta certified teachers represented the largest portion in all four categories.

The teachers first certified in Saskatchewan represented the second largest proportion of teachers in three of the four mobility groups. The exception was the exit-provincial mobile group. For the male sample, the Saskatchewan certified exit-provincial mobile teachers ranked fourth highest in percentage behind the teachers first certified in Alberta, Britain or Contin-



Table 4.6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS BY  
PLACE OF EARLIEST TEACHER CERTIFICATION  
AND MOBILITY

| Place of<br>earliest<br>certification | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Alberta                               | 65.2%          | 63.0%                | 31.4%               | 61.7%    | 55.3% |
| Saskatchewan                          | 13.4           | 13.0                 | 10.1                | 11.7     | 12.1  |
| Other Canadian<br>provinces           | 6.5            | 3.5                  | 11.1                | 10.0     | 7.8   |
| Britain or<br>continental<br>Europe   | 4.0            | 4.3                  | 17.4                | 8.3      | 8.5   |
| U.S.A.                                | 5.7            | 8.3                  | 14.0                | 3.3      | 7.8   |
| Australia or<br>New Zealand           | 1.2            | 3.0                  | 12.6                | 3.3      | 5.0   |
| Asia and other                        | 4.0            | 4.7                  | 3.4                 | 1.7      | 3.5   |



Table 4.7

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS BY  
PLACE OF EARLIEST TEACHER CERTIFICATION  
AND MOBILITY

| Place of<br>earliest<br>certification | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Alberta                               | 70.8%          | 66.6%                | 34.6%               | 56.9%    | 57.2% |
| Saskatchewan                          | 15.2           | 14.3                 | 19.0                | 12.3     | 15.2  |
| Other Canadian<br>provinces           | 8.2            | 7.2                  | 19.0                | 16.9     | 12.8  |
| Britain or<br>continental<br>Europe   | 2.9            | 5.6                  | 15.1                | 4.6      | 7.1   |
| U.S.A.                                | 1.6            | 1.6                  | 4.8                 | 4.6      | 3.2   |
| Australia or<br>New Zealand           | 0.2            | 0.9                  | 5.1                 | 1.5      | 1.9   |
| Asia and other                        | 1.2            | 3.7                  | 2.4                 | 3.0      | 2.6   |



ental Europe, and "Other Canadian Provinces." In the females' data, the "Saskatchewan" category had the second highest percentage of exit-provincial mobile teachers (19%). However, the category "Other Canadian Provinces" also had 19 percent of the exit-provincial mobile teachers.

All of the categories of teachers certified in places other than Alberta and Saskatchewan had much higher percentages of exit-provincial mobile and turnover teachers than non-mobile and inner-provincial mobile teachers.

Discussion. The Alberta certified teachers comprised the largest percentage of each of the four mobility groups. It was not surprising that a large percentage of a province's teachers were first certified in that province. However, the number of Alberta certified teachers who left the province for other teaching positions was approximately one-half the percentage of each of the other three categories. This exit-provincial mobile category may have been proportionally small because of the progressive reputation of Alberta's school systems. Few places in North America are reputed to have higher teacher salaries or better working conditions.

The largest departure from the others in terms of distribution among the four mobility categories was the exit-provincial mobile category. A greater proportion of teachers who were first certified in other Canadian provinces, Britain, continental Europe, U.S.A., Asia, Australia or New Zealand left Alberta to teach elsewhere than remained to teach in their present school or move



to another school. This may indicate the presence of a "nomadic" characteristic among persons who choose to teach a great distance from their place of earliest teacher certification or a "tourist" attitude toward their Alberta teaching position.

Teachers certified outside Alberta or Saskatchewan also seemed to have twice as great a tendency to leave the teaching profession as to remain in their present school. Perhaps some of these people originally came to Alberta hoping to teach only long enough to secure a non-educational position. However, another possible reason for leaving, may have been the result of cultural or language differences which they experienced.

This section on the earliest certification of teachers indicated that a large proportion of teachers first certified in places other than Alberta or Saskatchewan are highly mobile within and out of the teaching profession. These teachers may have accepted any position in order to live in Alberta, then moved to a better position after becoming settled in the Province.

#### IV. SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The situational characteristics chosen for analysis were: annual salary, school size, present school experience, full-time experience in education, and type of administration unit.

##### Annual Salary

Separate percentage distributions for male and female teachers in seven salary ranges are presented in Figures 4.8 and 4.9. Medians were also calculated for each of the mobility groups.



Table 4.8

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS  
BY PRESENT ANNUAL SALARY AND MOBILITY

| Annual<br>salary | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Under \$ 2,000   | 0.4%           | 0.4%                 | 0.5%                | 0.0%     | 0.3%  |
| 2,000 - 4,000    | 0.8            | 0.4                  | 0.0                 | 0.0      | 0.3   |
| 4,001 - 6,000    | 7.3            | 11.7                 | 13.0                | 16.4     | 12.1  |
| 6,001 - 8,000    | 41.9           | 46.5                 | 44.8                | 44.3     | 45.4  |
| 8,001 - 10,000   | 27.0           | 21.7                 | 22.2                | 23.0     | 23.5  |
| 10,001 - 12,000  | 21.8           | 18.9                 | 15.0                | 14.7     | 17.6  |
| 12,001 - 16,000  | 0.8            | 0.4                  | 0.5                 | 1.6      | 0.8   |
| Median           | \$7,945        | 7,613                | 7,495               | 7,516    | 7,642 |



Table 4.9

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS  
BY PRESENT ANNUAL SALARY AND MOBILITY

| Annual<br>salary | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Under \$4,000    | 1.0%           | 1.4%                 | 3.0%                | 0.0%     | 1.4%  |
| 4,001 - 6,000    | 32.1           | 43.0                 | 40.8                | 43.3     | 39.8  |
| 6,001 - 8,000    | 49.8           | 42.3                 | 42.9                | 47.7     | 45.7  |
| 8,001 - 10,000   | 6.8            | 9.3                  | 8.5                 | 9.0      | 8.4   |
| 10,001 - 12,000  | 10.1           | 4.0                  | 4.8                 | 0.0      | 4.7   |
| 12,001 - 16,000  | 0.2            | 0.0                  | 0.0                 | 0.0      | 0.0   |
| Median           | \$6,339        | 6,265                | 6,289               | 6,281    | 6,294 |



Findings. In all categories, the median salary for female teachers was more than \$1,200 below the male median salary for the same category. The highest median salary for male teachers was paid to the non-mobiles (\$7,945). Inner-provincial mobile (\$7,613), turnover (\$7,516) and exit-provincial mobile (\$7,495) teachers followed in rank order.

The highest median female salary was also that of the non-mobile teachers (\$6,339), followed in order by exit-provincial mobile (\$6,289), turnover (\$6,281) and inner-provincial mobile (\$6,265) teachers.

The percentage distributions indicated that the non-mobiles, especially the females, had more teachers in the \$10,001 - \$12,000 bracket than did any of the other three mobility categories. In addition, the turnover male teachers were well distributed over the top five salary categories, while the female turnover teachers were found mainly in only two of these salary categories.

Discussion. In each of the male and female distributions, the non-mobile teachers had the highest median salaries. Salary is a recognized satisfier. Therefore, those who believed they were earning an adequate salary may have been relatively content to remain in their present school system.

The three remaining male and female categories were logically ordered in relation to the research, cited in Chapter 2, by Patton, Bruce and Orlich. Both the exit-provincial and turnover teachers' median salaries were low. The former may have been leaving the Province in search of a teaching position offering a higher



salary. The latter may have been in search of a better salary outside the field of education. The inner-provincial mobile teachers, having the second highest median salary, were still paid less than the non-mobile teachers. Therefore, salary may have been a factor contributing to all three types of mobility.

Alberta teachers are paid according to amount of experience in education, and amount of academic and professional preparation. Therefore, the more experience a teacher has in the field of education, the higher is his salary. Similarly, the more academic and professional preparation a teacher has, the higher his salary.

As presented in detail later in this chapter (Tables 4.14 and 4.15), the non-mobile teachers, both males and females, had more full-time experience in education than did the other three categories. The male non-mobile teachers, as seen in Table 4.4, had as much or more academic and professional preparation than the other male categories. However, the female non-mobile teachers, as seen in Table 4.5, had the least amount of academic and professional training of all female categories. It was not surprising, therefore, that the male non-mobiles had the highest salary among the male categories. However, for the female non-mobile teachers, whose median salary was highest of the four categories, length of teaching experience seemed to be the factor compensating for lack of academic and professional preparation.

All male salaries were much higher than the female salaries. The differences were probably caused by the males' better academic and professional preparation (Tables 4.4 and 4.5) and greater



amount of experience in all categories (actual figures presented in Tables 4.14 and 4.15) except non-mobile. Since the female non-mobiles had more experience than the male non-mobiles, the larger male salaries must have been an effect of the males' having more academic and professional preparation.

### School Size

Separate distributions for male and female teachers according to the number of teachers employed in the school were prepared for each of the four mobility types. The results are given in Tables 4.10 and 4.11.

Findings. The non-mobile male teachers on the average taught in the largest schools with a median of 28.7 teachers per school. The turnover and exit-provincial male teachers taught in the second and third largest schools, having, respectively, 21.8 and 21.5 teachers per school. Of the four male categories, the inner-provincial mobile teachers taught in the smallest schools which had a median size of 20.8 teachers.

A different pattern was displayed by the female teachers. The turnover teachers were in schools having the largest median size, namely, 21.0 teachers. However, this category was closely followed by the exit-provincial mobile and non-mobile teachers with median sized schools of 20.3 and 19.7 teachers per school, respectively. The median size of the schools in which inner-provincial mobile teachers taught was 17.6 teachers, the smallest median of any of the female mobility categories.



Table 4.10

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS  
BY SIZE OF SCHOOL AND MOBILITY

| Number of<br>teachers in<br>school | Non-<br>mobile   | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 - 8                              | 2.8%             | 5.7%                 | 6.9%                | 9.9%     | 6.3%  |
| 9 - 18                             | 22.3             | 36.9                 | 31.7                | 29.9     | 30.2  |
| 19 - 24                            | 17.9             | 16.4                 | 18.8                | 17.1     | 17.6  |
| 25 - 49                            | 39.7             | 35.2                 | 31.7                | 27.9     | 33.6  |
| 59 - 99                            | 12.5             | 4.0                  | 9.4                 | 13.3     | 9.8   |
| 100 or more                        | 4.8              | 1.8                  | 1.5                 | 1.9      | 2.5   |
| Median                             | 28.7<br>teachers | 20.8                 | 21.5                | 21.8     | 23.2  |



Table 4.11

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS  
BY SIZE OF SCHOOL AND MOBILITY

| Number of<br>teachers in<br>school | Non-<br>mobile   | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 - 8                              | 10.3%            | 9.9%                 | 7.9%                | 9.1%     | 9.3%  |
| 9 - 18                             | 35.4             | 40.7                 | 34.6                | 34.8     | 36.4  |
| 19 - 24                            | 17.7             | 17.5                 | 20.8                | 12.1     | 17.0  |
| 25 - 49                            | 30.2             | 28.9                 | 27.9                | 34.8     | 30.4  |
| 59 - 99                            | 4.4              | 2.8                  | 7.0                 | 9.2      | 5.9   |
| 100 or more                        | 2.0              | 0.2                  | 1.8                 | 0.0      | 1.0   |
| Median                             | 19.7<br>teachers | 17.6                 | 20.3                | 21.0     | 19.7  |



Discussion. The category with the smallest median, based on school size in both male and female analysis, was inner-provincial mobile. This was highly predictable from Orlich's study of Idaho teachers (1967:451). Orlich's research strongly suggests that there is a tendency for teachers to move from small to larger schools. The data supported Orlich's finding, especially for the males, with the non-mobiles, on the whole, in the largest schools. It may be safe to speculate that men who intended to move within the Province were intending to move to a larger school than the one they were in. Possibly, the larger schools, with a variety of teaching positions available, gave the teachers a better opportunity to find satisfaction within the school.

The overall difference between the medians for the male and female teachers in this part of the analysis was probably an effect of the dominance of elementary teaching positions by females. Elementary schools tend to be smaller than secondary schools. Therefore, the females' medians for school size would tend to be smaller than the school size medians for the males.

The data did not reveal any major differences between the male and female exit-provincial mobile and turnover teachers on this variable of school size. School size, therefore, does not seem to be a significant factor in a teacher's decision to leave the Province to teach elsewhere or to leave the teaching profession.

#### Present School Experience

Separate distributions for male and female teachers, according to a teacher's experience in his present school, were prepared



for each of the four mobility types. The results are given in Tables 4.12 and 4.13.

Findings. The data indicated that the non-mobile female teachers had the greatest number of years of full-time experience (median 3.0 years) in their present school. Each of the other female categories had identical medians of less than one year.

Similar to the data for the females, the male non-mobiles had the greatest full-time service in their present schools (median 2.5 years). However, the turnover male teachers had the second highest median, 2.1 years. The final two male categories, exit-provincial and inner-provincial mobile, had medians of less than one year.

Discussion. The medians for both male and female categories revealed that the majority of mobile teachers stayed only one year in their present schools. Therefore, it seemed that the mobile teachers found some characteristics in their present school unsatisfactory. An exception was the male turnover category which had a median of 2.1 years. The turnover teacher seemed to have been dissatisfied with more than his present school. Otherwise, he should have planned only to transfer to another school, rather than leave the teaching profession entirely. Another possibility could be that some of the turnover teachers were released or "fired" from their present schools.

#### Full-time Experience in Education

Separate distributions for male and female teachers, accord-



Table 4.12

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS  
BY YEARS OF FULL-TIME EXPERIENCE  
IN THEIR PRESENT SCHOOL  
AND MOBILITY

| Present school<br>experience | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial   | Exit-<br>provincial    | Turnover | Total |
|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 year                       | 36.6%          | 55.8%                  | 53.9%                  | 45.9%    | 48.0% |
| 2                            | 21.5           | 19.7                   | 27.9                   | 24.6     | 23.4  |
| 3 - 4                        | 21.2           | 14.3                   | 12.9                   | 16.4     | 16.2  |
| 5 - 9                        | 14.2           | 6.3                    | 4.8                    | 3.3      | 7.2   |
| 10 - 14                      | 4.0            | 2.2                    | 0.0                    | 8.2      | 3.6   |
| 15 - 19                      | 0.9            | 1.3                    | 0.5                    | 0.0      | 0.7   |
| 20 - 24                      | 1.2            | 0.4                    | 0.0                    | 1.6      | 0.8   |
| Over 24                      | 0.4            | 0.0                    | 0.0                    | 0.0      | 0.1   |
| Median                       | 2.5<br>years   | less than<br>1.0 years | less than<br>1.0 years | 2.1      |       |



Table 4.13

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS  
BY YEARS OF FULL-TIME EXPERIENCE  
IN THEIR PRESENT SCHOOL  
AND MOBILITY

| Present school<br>experience | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover            | Total |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|
| 1 year                       | 31.9%          | 58.5%                | 64.2%               | 52.7%               | 51.8% |
| 2                            | 18.1           | 20.0                 | 21.1                | 18.4                | 19.4  |
| 3 - 4                        | 18.6           | 11.5                 | 10.5                | 14.9                | 13.9  |
| 5 - 9                        | 15.9           | 5.8                  | 3.9                 | 10.9                | 9.1   |
| 10 - 14                      | 8.9            | 2.6                  | 0.3                 | 3.1                 | 3.7   |
| 15 - 19                      | 5.8            | 1.4                  | 0.0                 | 0.0                 | 1.8   |
| Over 20                      | 0.8            | 0.2                  | 0.0                 | 0.0                 | 2.5   |
| Median                       | 3.0<br>years   | less than<br>1 year  | less than<br>1 year | less than<br>1 year |       |



ing to the length of the teachers' full-time experience in education, were prepared for the four mobility types. The results are reported in Tables 4.14 and 4.15.

Findings. Analysis of the data for the females revealed that turnover teachers, with a median of 3.6 years, had the least full-time experience. The exit-provincial and inner-provincial mobile teachers with medians of 4.1 and 4.2 years, respectively, had more full-time experience than the turnover teachers, but considerably less than the non-mobile teachers with a median of 9.5 years.

The data for the male sample revealed a trend similar to that of the female sample. However, the male non-mobile category (median 6.3 years) was well below the female median for the same category of teacher. Male medians in the other three categories were higher than female medians for the corresponding categories. The highest male median was for the non-mobile category. The rank order of the other male categories was, respectively, exit-provincial mobile (6.0 years), inner-provincial mobile (5.4 years) and turnover (4.7 years).

Discussion. The literature generally agrees that teachers leave the profession within the first five years of service. The data for both males and females supported this statement as the median teaching experience of male and female turnover teachers was 4.7 and 3.6 years, respectively.

The percentage distribution in each mobility category, except non-mobile, indicated a somewhat inverse relationship



Table 4.14

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS BY  
YEARS OF FULL-TIME EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION  
AND MOBILITY

| Years of<br>experience in<br>education | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 year                                 | 10.2%          | 17.0%                | 9.2%                | 4.9%     | 10.3% |
| 2                                      | 8.5            | 12.2                 | 12.6                | 13.1     | 11.6  |
| 3 - 4                                  | 22.0           | 16.2                 | 19.3                | 31.1     | 22.2  |
| 5 - 9                                  | 26.4           | 26.2                 | 30.0                | 23.0     | 26.3  |
| 10 - 14                                | 12.2           | 11.8                 | 11.6                | 8.2      | 11.0  |
| 15 - 19                                | 6.9            | 4.4                  | 11.6                | 9.8      | 8.2   |
| 20 - 24                                | 4.5            | 3.5                  | 2.9                 | 1.6      | 3.1   |
| 25 - 34                                | 6.5            | 6.1                  | 2.4                 | 3.4      | 4.6   |
| Over 34                                | 2.8            | 2.6                  | 0.4                 | 4.9      | 2.7   |
| Median                                 | 6.3<br>years   | 5.4                  | 6.0                 | 4.7      | 5.6   |



Table 4.15

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS BY  
YEARS OF FULL-TIME EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION  
AND MOBILITY

| Years of<br>experience in<br>education | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Total |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 year                                 | 9.2%           | 20.5%                | 10.2%               | 18.2%    | 14.5% |
| 2                                      | 5.9            | 15.1                 | 19.5                | 19.7     | 15.1  |
| 3 - 4                                  | 13.3           | 16.7                 | 25.8                | 21.2     | 19.3  |
| 5 - 9                                  | 21.5           | 21.5                 | 28.5                | 19.7     | 22.7  |
| 10 - 14                                | 14.8           | 11.1                 | 8.4                 | 13.6     | 12.0  |
| 15 - 19                                | 15.2           | 6.6                  | 3.6                 | 3.0      | 7.1   |
| 20 - 24                                | 10.5           | 4.0                  | 2.4                 | 3.1      | 5.0   |
| 25 - 34                                | 7.8            | 3.1                  | 1.6                 | 0.0      | 3.1   |
| Over 34                                | 1.8            | 1.4                  | 0.0                 | 1.5      | 1.2   |
| Median                                 | 9.5<br>years   | 4.2                  | 4.1                 | 3.6      | 5.4   |



between the number of teachers moving and years of experience in education. This trend was especially noticeable with the data for the female sample and was in agreement with research, reported in Chapter 2, by the Alberta Teachers' Association (1970:7).

The male non-mobile median for full-time experience in education was much lower than the female median for the same category. This may have been caused by males only recently entering the teaching profession in large numbers. As mentioned in Chapter 3 in the section "Overview of the Analysis," age and full-time experience in education correlated highly. The non-mobile males, therefore, with less experience than the non-mobile females, were probably younger than the non-mobile females.

#### Type of Administrative Unit

Separate distributions for male and female teachers, according to the type of administrative unit, were prepared for the four mobility groups. The results are reported in Tables 4.16 and 4.17 and the findings are presented separately for each of the sexes.

Findings (male). The largest proportion of male teachers from the "City" administrative units was found in the non-mobile category (49.0%). The turnover, exit-provincial mobile and inner-provincial categories followed with 43.1, 31.9 and 23.8 percent of "City" teachers, respectively.

The "Town" administrative units had male teachers distributed approximately equally (6.6 - 6.8%) among three categories, the inner-provincial mobile, the exit-provincial mobile and the



Table 4.16

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE TEACHERS BY  
TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT  
AND MOBILITY

| Type of administrative unit | Non-mobile | Inner-provincial | Exit-provincial | Turnover | Total |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|----------|-------|
| City                        | 49.0%      | 23.8%            | 31.9%           | 43.1%    | 37.0% |
| Town                        | 5.3        | 6.6              | 6.7             | 6.8      | 6.4   |
| Village and rural           | 43.7       | 67.0             | 59.0            | 46.7     | 54.0  |
| Other <sup>1</sup>          | 2.0        | 2.6              | 2.4             | 3.4      | 2.6   |

<sup>1</sup>Department of National Defence, Federal Indian, and private schools.

Table 4.17

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS BY  
TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT  
AND MOBILITY

| Type of administrative unit | Non-mobile | Inner-provincial | Exit-provincial | Turnover | Total |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|----------|-------|
| City                        | 44.6%      | 31.1%            | 45.4%           | 47.1%    | 42.1% |
| Town                        | 4.0        | 5.9              | 4.5             | 0.0      | 3.6   |
| Village and rural           | 48.0       | 60.4             | 45.2            | 43.9     | 49.3  |
| Other <sup>1</sup>          | 3.4        | 2.6              | 4.9             | 9.0      | 5.0   |

<sup>1</sup>Department of National Defence, Federal Indian, and private schools.



turnover categories. However, the proportion in the non-mobile category was slightly lower than for the other three categories, with a percentage of 5.3.

The largest proportion of male teachers from the "Village and rural" administrative units was found in the inner-provincial mobile category. The exit-provincial mobile, turnover and non-mobile teachers followed, respectively, with 59.0, 46.7 and 43.7 percent of village and rural teachers.

The "Other" administrative units had the largest proportion of its teachers in the turnover category (3.4%). The inner-provincial mobile, exit-provincial mobile and non-mobile categories, followed, respectively, with 2.6, 2.4 and 2.0 percent of "Other" teachers.

Findings (female). The female turnover teachers had the largest proportion of teachers from the "City" administrative units. The exit-provincial mobile, non-mobile and inner-provincial mobile categories followed, respectively, with 45.4, 44.6 and 31.1 percent of the "City" teachers.

The inner-provincial mobile teachers had the largest proportion of teachers from the "Town" administrative units (5.9%). The exit-provincial mobile and non-mobile teachers followed, each having 4.5 percent of "Town" teachers. There were no female turnover "Town" teachers.

The inner-provincial mobile category had the largest proportion of teachers from the "Village and rural" administrative units (60.4%). The non-mobile, exit-provincial and turnover



categories followed, respectively, with 48.0, 45.2 and 43.9 percent of "Village and rural" teachers.

The largest proportion of female teachers from the "Other" administrative units was found in the turnover category. The exit-provincial mobile, non-mobile and inner-provincial mobile categories followed, respectively, with 4.9, 3.4 and 2.6 percent of "Other" female teachers.

Discussion. A much smaller proportion of male and female "City" teachers was found in the inner-provincial mobile category than in any of the other three categories. City teachers, who chose to remain in the teaching profession, seemed to prefer staying in their present system rather than moving to teach elsewhere in the Province.

A small proportion of Alberta's male and female teachers were employed in "Town" administrative units. The non-mobile teachers accounted for the smallest proportion of teachers in these administrative units. There seemed to be a trend to leave the town administrative units rather than to remain in them. A peculiar result was obtained with the female turnover teachers in town administrative units. No female teacher who was teaching in a town district indicated that she was leaving the profession. The female teachers in town administrative units seemed to be content with teaching as an occupation.

More male and female teachers taught in the village and rural units than in any of the other types of administrative units. A greater proportion of these teachers were found in the inner-



provincial mobile category than any of the other three mobility categories. These teachers in the village and rural administrative units, seemed to have a greater than usual tendency to move within the Province.

In comparison with the other mobility groups, the largest proportion of male and female teachers from the "Other" administrative units were in the turnover category. This may suggest that teachers from the Department of National Defence, Federal Indian and private schools looked upon teaching as a temporary career.

There seemed to be a general trend among male and female teachers to move from rural administrative units and to remain in the city administrative units. The city administrative units had a greater proportion of non-mobile teachers than inner-provincial mobile teachers. The village and rural administrative units had a greater proportion of inner-provincial mobile teachers than non-mobile teachers. Research findings in the Alberta Teachers' Association study (1970:2), referred to in Chapter 2, strongly support this finding.

## V. MISASSIGNMENT

Three sets of misassignment scores were calculated. The first, M-1, dealt with the congruence between a teacher's subject assignment and subject specialization. The second, M-2, dealt with the congruence between a teacher's subject assignment and subject preference. The third was a composite of the first two scores.



The results are given in Tables 4.18, 4.19 and 4.20, respectively.

#### Misassignment According to Subject Specialization

Separate male and female M-1 means and total M-1 means were calculated for each of the four mobility groups. One-way Analyses of Variance were performed between pairs of the male and female means within each mobility category, and then for the four means of each of the mobility groups.

Findings. The male M-1 misassignment means were slightly higher than the female means in all mobility types except the inner-provincial mobile. The male means were ranked as follows: turnover (5.53), non-mobile (5.52), exit-provincial mobile (5.48) and inner-provincial mobile (5.20). The female means ranged in almost a completely reverse order to that of the males as follows: inner-provincial mobile (5.42), non-mobile (5.30), exit-provincial mobile (5.19) and turnover (5.04). However, none of the male-female pairs were significantly different at the .05 probability level.

The highest M-1 mean for the total groups was in the non-mobile category (5.42). The exit-provincial mobile, turnover and inner-provincial mobile categories followed, respectively, with means of 5.37, 5.34 and 5.29. However, none of the total means were significantly different at the .05 probability level.

Discussion. The male-female pairs for the four mobility categories were not significantly different. In addition, no significant differences were found between the total means of the



Table 4.18

SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION MISASSIGNMENT SCORES  
OF TEACHERS BY MOBILITY  
AND SEX

| Sex           | Non-mobile |      | Inner-provincial |      | Exit-provincial |      | Turnover |      |
|---------------|------------|------|------------------|------|-----------------|------|----------|------|
|               | Mean       | S.D. | Mean             | S.D. | Mean            | S.D. | Mean     | S.D. |
| Male          | 5.52       | 1.59 | 5.20             | 1.71 | 5.48            | 1.47 | 5.53     | 1.79 |
| Female        | 5.30       | 1.62 | 5.42             | 1.71 | 5.19            | 1.59 | 5.04     | 2.23 |
| Significance  | NS         |      | NS               |      | NS              |      | NS       |      |
| Total         | 5.42       |      | 5.29             |      | 5.37            |      | 5.34     |      |
| F ratio -     | 0.36       |      |                  |      |                 |      |          |      |
| Significance: | NS         |      |                  |      |                 |      |          |      |



Table 4.19  
SUBJECT PREFERENCE MISASSIGNMENT SCORES  
OF TEACHERS BY MOBILITY  
AND SEX

| Sex   | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover  |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|
|   | Mean S.D.      | Mean S.D.            | Mean S.D.           | Mean S.D. |
| Male  | 2.72 0.82      | 2.50 0.89            | 2.56 0.84           | 2.38 0.98 |
| Female  | 2.61 0.79      | 2.48 0.91            | 2.47 0.86           | 2.31 0.97 |
| Signif-<br>icance                             | NS             | NS                   | NS                  | NS        |
| Total   | 2.67           | 2.49                 | 2.52                | 2.35      |
| F ratio - 4.06      P = .007                  |                |                      |                     |           |
| Significance: between non-mobile and turnover |                |                      |                     |           |



Table 4.20  
COMBINED MISASSIGNMENT SCORES OF TEACHERS  
BY MOBILITY AND SEX

| Sex               | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover  |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|
|                   | Mean S.D.      | Mean S.D.            | Mean S.D.           | Mean S.D. |
| Male              | 8.24 2.09      | 7.70 2.31            | 8.04 1.96           | 7.91 2.32 |
| Female            | 7.91 2.12      | 7.90 2.37            | 7.65 2.13           | 7.34 2.81 |
| Signif-<br>icance | NS             | NS                   | NS                  | NS        |
| Total             | 8.09           | 7.78                 | 7.89                | 7.69      |
| F ratio - 1.41    |                |                      |                     |           |
| Significance: NS  |                |                      |                     |           |



mobility categories. These results indicate that the males' subject assignment, according to subject specialization, was not significantly different than the females' assignment. Also, there was no significant difference in assignment among the four mobility categories.

The M-1 means are rather surprising. As noted in Tables 4.4 and 4.5, the males had much more academic and professional preparation than females. It seems reasonable that the better educated teachers would be assigned more often to their field of specialization than teachers with less education. However, the misassignment sample was composed of only secondary teachers, whereas, the sample used for academic and professional training also included elementary teachers as well as secondary teachers. Secondary female teachers may be as well educated as secondary male teachers.

It also seems reasonable that there should have been some significant differences between the mobility categories. It should be of concern to a teacher that he be employed to teach in the field of his academic specialization. However, an overview of the M-1 means denotes that the range was 5.04 to 5.53. A score of over five on the M-1 scale meant that a teacher was teaching in his first or second field of specialization. Therefore, the majority of teachers in each of the four mobility groups were quite well assigned. This could account for no significant differences among the four mobility groups.



### Misassignment According to Subject Preference

Separate male and female M-2 means and total M-2 means were calculated for each of the four mobility groups. Then One-way Analyses of Variance were performed on the male and female mean scores and the total means for each of the four mobility categories.

Findings. The mean M-2 scores revealed that in each category the males had a slightly higher score than the females. However, no male-female pair was significantly different at the .05 probability level. The male M-2 means, in rank order, were non-mobile (2.72), exit-provincial mobile (2.56), inner-provincial mobile (2.50) and turnover (2.38). The female M-2 means were similar to the male means as follows: non-mobile (2.61), inner-provincial mobile (2.48), exit-provincial mobile (2.47) and turnover (2.31).

Significant differences among total means at the .05 probability level were identified by the Analysis of Variance test. The Scheffe test, used to compare these means two at a time, revealed that the significant difference was between the means for the non-mobile and turnover teachers. The non-mobile teachers had the highest mean score of 2.67, which was followed, respectively, by the exit-provincial mobile (2.52), inner-provincial mobile (2.49) and the turnover (2.35) teachers.

Discussion. These results were similar to those for the M-1 scores in that no significant differences between the male-



female pairs were found. The literature strongly suggests that mobility studies should present data for males and females separately. However, these data indicated that there was little difference in the amount of misassignment between males and females in relation to their subject specialization and subject assignment.

The results for the four mobility categories were much as expected. In all probability, a teacher intending to remain in his present school for another year, is quite satisfied with his assignment. The results supported this argument as the non-mobile teachers had the highest mean and, therefore, the best subject assignment according to their preference. The turnover teachers' mean was the lowest among the four mobility groups and was significantly different from the non-mobile teachers' mean. These two categories, M-1 scores, were not significantly different. The M-2 scores, therefore, may be a better indication of a teacher's satisfaction with the teaching profession. In any case, the analysis revealed an apparent relationship between assignment to the preferred subject area and a teacher's decision to remain in teaching as an occupation.

The means of the inner-provincial mobile and exit-provincial mobile categories were not significantly different from those of the non-mobile category. This would seem to indicate that assignment according to a teacher's specialization is not related to a teacher's decision to leave his present school and move to another school.



### Combined Misassignment

Separate male and female and total means for the combined M-1 and M-2 scores were calculated for each of the four mobility groups. Then One-way Analyses of Variance were performed on the male and female means within each mobility category, and the total means for the four mobility groups. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 4.20.

Findings. The male means were ranked as follows: non-mobile (8.24), exit-provincial mobile (8.04), turnover (7.91) and inner-provincial mobile (7.70). The female means were ranked slightly different from the males with: non-mobile (7.91), inner-provincial mobile (7.90), exit-provincial mobile (7.65) and turnover (7.34). No significant differences were found between pairs of the male and female means.

The highest total mean (8.09) belonged to the non-mobile category. The exit-provincial, inner-provincial and turnover categories followed with means of 7.89, 7.78 and 7.69, respectively. The One-way Analyses of Variance tests revealed no significant differences among the mobility groups.

Discussion. No significant differences were found among the male-female pairs of the four mobility groups. Male and female teachers, therefore, seemed to be approximately equally assigned in relation to their subject preference and subject specialization combined.

No significant differences were found among the total means



of the four mobility categories. This result was not expected as it seemed reasonable to assume that subject misassignment may have been a grievance among mobile and turnover teachers.

The total mean scores ranged from 7.69 to 8.09. The highest score obtainable on this scale was 11; such a score for a given teacher would indicate that the teacher's subject preference and subject specialization were the same, and he was teaching in this subject matter area. The lowest possible score was 2, indicating complete misassignment, that is, there was no congruence between any two of the three variables. The range of the means, therefore, was well above the mid-point of the Combined Misassignment Scale. Alberta teachers may have been generally well enough assigned so that Combined Misassignment was not an important factor relating to mobility and turnover among these teachers.

## VI. INSTRUCTIONAL LOAD

Separate male and female means, and total means for the Instructional Load scores were calculated for each of the mobility groups. Then One-way Analyses of Variance tests were performed on the male and female means within each mobility category and on the total means for the four mobility groups.

Findings. The male means were higher than the female means in all four mobility categories. For three of these categories, inner-provincial mobile, non-mobile and exit-provincial mobile, the male means were significantly higher than the female means at the .001 probability level. The rank order of the male



Instructional Load means, from highest to lowest, was exit-provincial mobile (11.36), non-mobile (11.07), inner-provincial mobile (10.81) and turnover (10.74). The female rank order of Instructional Load means for the mobility categories was turnover (10.15), inner-provincial mobile (10.04), exit-provincial mobile (10.00) and non-mobile (9.87). The findings are reported in Table 4.21.

When tested, there were no significant differences at the .05 probability level, between the total means of the four mobility groups. The highest total mean belonged to the exit-provincial mobile (10.53). The turnover, inner-provincial mobile and non-mobile categories followed with means of 10.44, 10.31 and 10.26, respectively.

Discussion. The finding that the male means were higher than the female means indicated that males, as measured by the instrument used in the present study, carried a heavier instructional load than did females. This result may have been partially caused by the majority of male teachers teaching in secondary schools. Most secondary schools operate on a class rotation or departmentalized schedule allowing a teacher to teach three or more different classes. Therefore, the secondary teachers' answers to the question on "total number of different pupils that you teach in a week" would be a number much higher than that given by most elementary teachers. A second factor that may have influenced the results was the validity of the question, "How many hours per week do you spend in classroom teaching?" As mentioned in Chapter 3, many elementary teachers seemed to answer this question as "hours







per day" instead of "hours per week." Therefore, this question which should have produced high scores for the elementary teachers, may have produced scores which were quite low. However, the possibility of male teachers carrying a larger Instructional Load than female teachers should not be ruled out.

Statistical analyses found no significant differences among the means of the four mobility groups. This was a surprising result as researchers such as Conville and Anderson (1956:12) and Patton (1957:17) found that instructional load was an important factor in teacher satisfaction. However, the average instructional load carried by teachers may have lightened since their research was done. The results in Table 4.21 show that the total means of each of the four mobility groups were less than half of the total score possible on the Instructional Load Scale. These means may indicate that the instructional load of Alberta teachers was at a "tolerable" level. If this were so, instructional load would not be an important factor contributing to a teacher's decision to move to another school or to leave teaching entirely.

## VII. WORKING CONDITIONS

Separate male and female means, and total means for the Working Conditions scores were calculated for each of the mobility categories. Then One-way Analyses of Variance tests were performed on the male-female pairs and on the total means for the four mobility categories. The results are presented in Table 4.22.

A high Working Conditions score indicated good working conditions. The lower the score obtained on the Working Conditions



Table 4.22

WORKING CONDITION SCORES OF TEACHERS  
BY MOBILITY AND SEX

| Sex  | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover  |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|
|  | Mean S.D.      | Mean S.D.            | Mean S.D.           | Mean S.D. |
| Male   | 8.29 1.63      | 7.65 1.96            | 7.83 1.74           | 7.57 2.40 |
| Female   | 7.84 1.90      | 7.37 2.06            | 7.89 2.01           | 7.52 2.00 |
| Signif-<br>icance  | 0.001          | NS                   | NS                  | NS        |
| Total  | 7.99           | 7.47                 | 7.86                | 7.55      |
| F ratio - 9.64      P = 0.001  |                |                      |                     |           |
| Significance: between inner-provincial and non-mobile,<br>inner-provincial and exit-provincial, and<br>non-mobile and turnover |                |                      |                     |           |



Scale, the worse were the teacher's working conditions.

Findings. All female categories, except the exit-provincial mobile category, had lower Working Conditions means than did the males. However, for only the non-mobile male-female pair was there a significant difference in means at the .05 probability level. The rank order of the male means was: non-mobile (8.29), exit-provincial mobile (7.83), inner-provincial mobile (7.65) and turnover (7.57). The female rank order differed from the males as follows: exit-provincial mobile (7.89), non-mobile (7.84), turnover (7.52) and inner-provincial mobile (7.37).

A significant difference at the .001 probability level was found for the total Working Conditions means. The Scheffe test established the following pairs as having significantly different means at the .05 probability level: inner-provincial mobile and non-mobile, inner-provincial mobile and exit-provincial mobile, and non-mobile and turnover. The rank order of the total Working Conditions means was: non-mobile (7.99), exit-provincial mobile (7.86), turnover (7.55) and inner-provincial mobile (7.47).

Discussion. The non-mobile male teachers' mean was significantly higher than the non-mobile female teachers' mean. Therefore, according to the Working Conditions Scale, the male non-mobile teachers had better working conditions than did the female non-mobile teachers. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of female teachers taught in elementary schools and the majority of males taught in secondary schools. Therefore, it



appears that the elementary schools generally had worse working conditions than secondary schools, as measured by the instrument employed in the present study.

The total means for exit-provincial and inner-provincial mobiles were significantly different. The exit-provincial mobiles, whose mean was the higher, had better working conditions than the inner-provincial mobile teachers. The teachers moving to a new school within the Province, had the worst working conditions, as measured by the instrument employed in the present study, among the four mobility groups. It seems reasonable, therefore, that the teachers moving within the Province were doing so, at least partially, because of poor working conditions.

The non-mobile teachers' total mean was significantly different from the turnover and the inner-provincial mobile teachers' means. Teachers with high Working Conditions scores appeared to be more likely to remain in their present school system, and the teachers with low Working Conditions scores seemed to be more likely to leave the teaching profession entirely or move to another school system. The Working Conditions data seemed to indicate that there was a relationship between turnover and mobility in teaching and the working conditions in the schools of the Province.



## Chapter 5

### SUMMARY. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of this study is presented in this chapter. Conclusions and implications are drawn from its findings, and suggestions are presented for further research.

#### 1. SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH DESIGN

##### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to compare characteristics of mobile and turnover teachers with characteristics of non-mobile teachers in Alberta in an attempt to identify predictors of turnover and mobility among teachers.

##### Sub-problem

What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to:

- (a) personal characteristics,
- (b) professional characteristics,
- (c) situational characteristics,
- (d) subject assignment,
- (e) school working conditions, and
- (f) instructional load?

##### Instrumentation and Methodology

The questionnaire was issued during May, 1969, to all



teachers employed in Alberta school systems, in a study directed by Ratsoy for the Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies. Teachers and administrators completed and returned 18,074 usable questionnaires. This return represented approximately 90 percent of the Alberta education force.

The questionnaire was composed of fifty-nine forced-choice questions, dealing with personal and professional characteristics, experience, mobility and instructional practices of Alberta teachers. Reliability of the questionnaire appeared to be approximately 98 percent.

Items from the questionnaire relating to personal, professional and situational characteristics, subject misassignment, working conditions and instructional load of teachers were used in the present study.

Five scales were used in the present study. The first two scales dealt with subject misassignment as related to teacher subject specialization and to teacher subject preference. The third scale was a composite of the first two scales. The fourth and fifth scales were constructed to measure teacher instructional load and teacher working conditions in the schools. All scales were constructed from questionnaire responses.

Percentage distributions on nine personal, professional and situational characteristics for four mobility types were calculated. Comparisons were then made among the four mobility types. The personal characteristics chosen were sex and marital status. The professional characteristics chosen were academic and professional



preparation, and place of earliest teacher certification. The situational characteristics chosen were annual salary, school size, present school experience, full-time experience in education, and type of administrative unit.

The remaining five variables were misassignment according to subject specialization, misassignment according to subject preference, misassignment according to a combination of subject preference and specialization, working conditions and instructional load. On these variables, One-way Analysis of Variance tests were performed to determine whether differences among the four mobility groups existed. Whenever the F ratio was significant, this test was followed by the Scheffe method of testing for significant differences between pairs of means. The a priori level of significance for both tests was set at .05.

### The Sample

The sample was delimited to full-time teachers classified into four categories. Teachers indicating they would be teaching in another Alberta system during the next school year were categorized as inner-provincial mobile teachers. Teachers indicating they would be teaching in a school system outside of Alberta in the next school year were categorized as exit-provincial mobiles. The third category, non-mobile, was composed of teachers intending to teach in their present school during the next school year. A random sample of the 10,000 Alberta non-mobile teachers were used in the study to facilitate data handling. The last category, Turn-over teachers, consisted of teachers intending to be employed out-



side of education during the next school year.

The total sample was 2,098 full-time teachers. The number of teachers assorted into inner-provincial mobile, non-mobile, exit-provincial mobile and turnover was 659, 765, 542 and 132, respectively. This sample was used for all data analyses with only one exception.

The exception was in dealing with the misassignment of teachers. Since teachers are not usually departmentalized or assigned to specific subject areas in elementary schools, the elementary teachers were not used in the misassignment analyses. Therefore, the sample was reduced to secondary teachers consisting of 319 inner-provincial mobile, 342 non-mobile, 267 exit-provincial mobile and 74 turnover teachers. The total sample used in the misassignment analyses was 1,002 full-time secondary teachers.

## II. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

This study sought answers to six sub-problems. These sub-problems and a brief discussion of the major related findings are given below. Also see Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

Sub-problem one: What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to personal characteristics?

The personal characteristics chosen from the questionnaire for analyses were sex and marital status.

The analysis by sex revealed that with the exception of the turnover category, over 60 percent of the teachers in each category were female. Turnover teachers were almost equally divided between males and females.



Table 5.1

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND  
SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS<sup>1</sup>

| Characteristic   | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover    |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| <u>Sex</u>   |                |                      |                     |             |
| male   | 32.3%          | 35.4                 | 38.8                | 47.7        |
| female   | 67.7%          | 64.6                 | 61.2                | 52.3        |
| <u>Marital Status</u>  |                |                      |                     |             |
| male - single  | 19.5%          | 26.3                 | 24.5                | 26.7        |
| - married  | 80.5%          | 73.7                 | 75.5                | 73.3        |
| female - single  | 20.0%          | 48.3                 | 65.2                | 50.0        |
| - married  | 80.0%          | 51.7                 | 34.8                | 50.0        |
| <u>Academic and Profes-<br/>sional Preparation<br/>Medians</u> |                |                      |                     |             |
| male   | 4.4 years      | 4.2                  | 4.4                 | 4.3         |
| female   | 2.6 years      | 3.0                  | 3.5                 | 3.2         |
| <u>Annual Salary Medians</u>                                   |                |                      |                     |             |
| male   | \$7,945        | 7,613                | 7,495               | 7,516       |
| female   | \$6,339        | 6,265                | 6,289               | 6,281       |
| <u>Size of School Medians<br/>(in teachers/school)</u>         |                |                      |                     |             |
| male   | 28.7           | 20.8                 | 21.5                | 21.8        |
| female   | 19.7           | 17.6                 | 20.3                | 21.0        |
| <u>Present School Experi-<br/>ence Medians</u>                 |                |                      |                     |             |
| male   | 2.5 years      | less than 1          | less than 1         | 2.1         |
| female   | 3.0 years      | less than 1          | less than 1         | less than 1 |
| <u>Full-time Experience<br/>Medians</u>                        |                |                      |                     |             |
| male   | 6.3 years      | 5.4                  | 6.0                 | 4.7         |
| female   | 9.5 years      | 4.2                  | 4.1                 | 3.6         |

<sup>1</sup>"Teacher certification" and "administrative unit" data, composed only of percentages, are not included in this table.



Table 5.2

SUMMARY OF MISASSIGNMENT, INSTRUCTIONAL LOAD  
AND WORKING CONDITIONS SCORES

| Variable   | Non-<br>mobile | Inner-<br>provincial | Exit-<br>provincial | Turnover | Signifi-<br>cance                                     |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| Subject speciali-<br>zation misassignment<br>means   |                |                      |                     |          |   |
| male   | 5.52           | 5.20                 | 5.48                | 5.53     | NS  |
| female   | 5.30           | 5.42                 | 5.19                | 5.04     |   |
| total  | 5.42           | 5.29                 | 5.37                | 5.34     | NS  |
| Subject preference<br>misassignment<br>means   |                |                      |                     |          |   |
| male   | 2.72           | 2.50                 | 2.56                | 2.38     | NS  |
| female   | 2.61           | 2.48                 | 2.47                | 2.31     |   |
| total  | 2.67           | 2.49                 | 2.52                | 2.35     | non-mobile<br>and<br>turnover                         |
| Combined<br>misassignment<br>means   |                |                      |                     |          |   |
| male   | 8.24           | 7.70                 | 8.04                | 7.91     | NS  |
| female   | 7.91           | 7.90                 | 7.65                | 7.34     |   |
| total  | 8.09           | 7.78                 | 7.89                | 7.69     | NS  |
| Instructional<br>load means  |                |                      |                     |          |   |
| male   | 11.07          | 10.81                | 11.36               | 10.74    | Significance<br>in<br>all<br>except<br>turnover<br>NS |
| female   | 9.87           | 10.04                | 10.00               | 10.15    |   |
| total  | 10.26          | 10.31                | 10.53               | 10.44    |   |
| Working Conditions<br>means  |                |                      |                     |          |   |
| male   | 8.29           | 7.65                 | 7.83                | 7.57     | non-mobile  |
| female   | 7.84           | 7.37                 | 7.89                | 7.52     |   |
| total  | 7.99           | 7.47                 | 7.86                | 7.55     | *   |
| * Inner-provincial and non-mobile<br>Inner-provincial and exit-provincial<br>Non-mobile and Turnover |                |                      |                     |          |   |



Over 73 percent of all male teachers in the sample were married, widowed or divorced. The male non-mobile category had the largest percentage of married, widowed or divorced teachers (80.5 percent) among the four male mobility categories.

The marital status of female teachers varied among mobility categories. The non-mobile category was composed of 80.0 percent of married, widowed or divorced teachers. The inner-provincial mobile and turnover female teachers were approximately equally divided among the "married" and "single" categories. However, less than 35 percent of the female exit-provincial mobile teachers were classified in the "married" category.

Sub-problem two: What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to professional characteristics?

The professional characteristics chosen for analysis were academic and professional preparation, and place of earliest teacher certification.

The academic and professional preparation medians of the male teachers proved to be almost identical for all four mobility categories, that is, ranging from 4.2 to 4.4 years. All male medians were higher than female medians. The rank order of the female medians placed the exit-provincial mobiles highest, followed by turnover, inner-provincial mobile and non-mobile categories.

Teachers first certified in Alberta represented the largest portion of teachers in all four mobility categories. Only the exit-provincial mobile teachers had a significantly different distribution from the other Alberta categories. This category had



approximately one-half of the percentage which each of the other "Alberta" mobility categories had.

Teachers first certified in Saskatchewan represented the second largest proportion of teachers in all mobility categories with one exception. The exception was the exit-provincial mobile category. For the male sample, teachers first certified in Saskatchewan were fifth largest in proportion of exit-provincial mobile teachers, following Alberta, Britain or continental Europe, the United States, and other Canadian provinces. For the female sample, the "Saskatchewan" teachers and teachers first certified in other Canadian provinces, were tied for the second largest percentage of exit-provincial teachers.

There were more exit-provincial mobile and turnover teachers than non-mobile and inner-provincial mobile teachers among the teachers first certified in places other than Alberta or Saskatchewan.

Sub-problem three: What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to situational characteristics?

The situational characteristics chosen for analysis were: annual salary, school size, present school experience, full-time experience in education, and type of administrative unit.

In all categories, the median salary for female teachers was more than \$1,200 below the male median for the same category. The male and female non-mobile categories had the highest salaries of the four mobility categories. The male exit-provincial



mobiles were the lowest paid males, and the female inner-provincial mobiles were the lowest paid females.

The non-mobile male teachers, on the average, taught in the largest schools, with a median of 28.7 teachers per school. Of the male mobility categories, the inner-provincial mobile teachers taught in the smallest schools (median 20.8 teachers per school). All male mobility categories had larger "school size" medians than the corresponding female categories.

The turnover female teachers taught in schools having the largest median size of the female categories, namely, 21.0 teachers. The inner-provincial mobile teachers, whose median for school size was 17.6 teachers, taught in the smallest schools of any mobility category.

For both the male and female samples, the non-mobile teachers had the greatest number of years of full-time experience in their present schools. Each of the other female mobility categories had medians of less than one year. The turnover male teachers ranked second highest in the male sample, while the exit-provincial and inner-provincial male categories each had medians of less than one year of experience in their present schools.

The analyses of the full-time experience in education data for the female sample revealed a large difference between the non-mobile median (9.5 years) and the medians for the other three mobility categories (3.6 - 4.2 years). The turnover teachers had the least full-time experience in education among the female categories.

The non-mobile males had the most full-time experience in



education (median of 6.3 years) among the male categories. However, this median was well below the female non-mobile median. In other categories, males had more experience in education than their female counterparts. The male category with the least full-time experience in education was the turnover category.

The largest proportion of male and female teachers were employed in the village and rural areas of Alberta. Among these teachers there seemed to be a greater than average tendency to move within the province. The male and female teachers employed in the city administrative units comprised the second largest proportion of Alberta teachers. These city teachers, more than others, tended to remain within their district rather than move to another district within the Province.

The town administrative units, and Department of National Defence, Federal Indian and private schools employed a small proportion of teachers in Alberta. However, among these teachers, especially the females, there was a greater than average tendency to leave the teaching profession.

Sub-problem four: What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to subject assignment?

Subject assignment of teachers was analyzed according to the congruence between the teachers' present assignments and each of: their subject specializations, subject preferences, and a combination of subject specialization and subject preference.

Male teachers were not assigned differently from female teachers according to subject specialization. Although all male



M-1 means were higher than the female M-1 means, no significant differences were obtained between sexes. In addition, the four mobility categories did not differ significantly in the degree to which they were assigned according to subject specialization.

The degree of assignment according to subject preference seemed to be similar between male and female pairs, as no significant differences were found between these pairs on the M-2 scores. However, a significant difference was found between the non-mobile and turnover categories. The non-mobile teachers, with the higher M-2 scores, appeared to be better assigned than the turnover teachers in accordance with their subject preference. No other significant differences were found among mobility categories.

No significant differences were found between male-female pairs or among the four mobility groups according to the Combined Misassignment scores. These scores seemed to indicate that no differences existed between males and females in each mobility group, and among mobile, non-mobile and turnover teachers in the degree of subject assignment according to subject preference and subject specialization.

Sub-problem five: What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to school working conditions?

Only the non-mobile male-female pair had significantly different Working Conditions means at the .05 probability level. The non-mobile males, with the higher Working Conditions mean, seemed to have better working conditions than the non-mobile females, as measured by the Working Conditions Scale.



The Scheffe test established the following pairs as having significantly different means: inner-provincial mobile and non-mobile, inner-provincial mobile and exit-provincial mobile, and non-mobile and turnover. The non-mobile teachers, with the highest mean, appeared to have significantly better working conditions than both the inner-provincial mobile and turnover teachers. In addition, the exit-provincial mobile teachers, with the larger Working Conditions mean, appeared to have better working conditions than the inner-provincial mobile teachers.

Sub-problem six: What are the similarities and differences that exist among non-mobile, mobile and turnover teachers with respect to instructional load?

The male Instructional Load means were higher than the female Instructional Load means in all four mobility categories. For three of these categories, inner-provincial mobile, non-mobile and exit-provincial mobile, the male means were significantly higher than the female means at the .001 probability level. The higher male scores seemed to indicate that the males carried a heavier instructional load, as measured by the Instructional Load Scale, than the females in all categories except turnover.

No significant differences were found among the total Instructional Load means for the mobility categories. Apparently, the instructional load did not differ significantly among mobile, non-mobile and turnover teachers.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

From the findings of this study, the following conclusions



may be drawn:

1. The percentage of females is greater than males among mobile and non-mobile teachers. However, teachers leaving the profession for employment outside of education are equally composed of males and females.

2. Married teachers, especially married females, exhibit a greater tendency to remain in their present schools than do single teachers.

3. Teachers first certified outside of Alberta and Saskatchewan exhibit a greater tendency to move out of Alberta to another teaching position than do teachers who were first certified in either of these two provinces.

4. Salary seems to be a predictor of teacher mobility. The higher a teacher's salary, the more likely was he to remain in his present school.

5. Amount of academic and professional preparation is not an important factor in predicting male teacher mobility. However, the amount of academic and professional preparation among female teachers was directly related to mobility. The more preparation among female teachers, the more likely they were to be mobile.

6. Teachers leaving the profession usually do so before completing five years of full-time teaching experience. After a female teacher has had five or more years of full-time experience in education, she exhibits a greater than usual tendency to remain in her present school. However, length of full-time experience does not seem to be important as a predictor of mobility for male teachers.



7. Most teachers leaving their present school to teach elsewhere, had taught in their present school for only one year. The majority of teachers remaining in their present school have taught in that school for more than two years.

8. The village and rural administrative units had the largest amount of male and female teacher mobility. The male teachers in the city administrative units exhibit a greater tendency than usual not to move within the province. The Department of National Defence, Federal Indian and private schools have proportionally larger numbers of male and female teachers leaving the profession than do other types of administrative units.

9. Male teachers generally teach in larger schools than do female teachers. Male teachers in large schools exhibit a greater than usual tendency to remain in that school. School size does not seem to be an important factor in predicting female mobility.

10. Assignment according to teacher subject specialization does not seem to be predictive of teacher mobility.

11. Assignment according to teacher subject preference seems to be predictive of teacher mobility. Teachers assigned to their subject preference tend to remain in their present schools. Teachers not assigned to their subject preference had a greater tendency than the others to leave the teaching profession.

12. When a teacher is well trained for his present assignment and also prefers the assignment, he does not have a higher probability of remaining in his present school. When the two variables, subject preference and subject specialization, are



combined, they do not seem to be predictive of teacher mobility.

13. Male teachers generally appear to have heavier instructional loads than do female teachers. However, instructional load does not seem to be a predictor of teacher mobility.

14. Working conditions appear to be predictive of teacher turnover and mobility. Teachers with good working conditions in their schools, as assessed by the questionnaire used in the present study, are more likely to remain in these schools than teachers with less desirable working conditions. In addition, there was a significantly higher probability that teachers deciding to leave the profession have poorer working conditions than those intending to remain in it. The working conditions of females, on the average, are less favorable than working conditions of males.

15. Male and female teachers seemed generally to have different response distributions and, therefore, probably different reasons for deciding to leave their present schools. However, the differences between sexes diminish for those teachers deciding to leave the profession.

#### IV. IMPLICATIONS

What relevance does a teacher mobility study have in this period of time when a surplus of teachers in many areas makes it difficult to find employment? Administrators and supervisors should continually be interested in research which may reveal undesirable school and teacher characteristics. Teachers are, at present, not moving from school to school as frequently as in years past. How-



ever, the teachers are less mobile because of a lack of employment opportunities, not because the school systems have improved conditions so as to satisfy the teachers. There will still be teachers in schools with similar grievances to those teachers who left in previous years. Teachers unsatisfied with present conditions may leave their positions "psychologically" rather than physically because they cannot obtain a position elsewhere. Therefore, the challenge for administrators and supervisors is one of identifying the dissatisfied teachers and the conditions which, if changed, might improve the attitudes of these teachers toward the school. The ultimate goal for the administrators and supervisors should be to obtain a maximum effort from all teachers.

This study attempted to provide information on the mobility of teachers. Results from the study which may assist administrators and supervisors to perform more effectively in relation to the mobile teacher are given below.

Administrators should not think that mobility and turnover is only a problem with male teachers. This study has shown that at least as many females as males leave the profession for other employment or move from their present school to teach in another school.

Rural administrative units seemed to have had a more serious problem with teacher mobility than the city administrative units. Therefore, this study may be of major interest to rural administrators.

The administrators of a school system should pay particular attention to the needs of single teachers , especially female, with



less than five years of experience. The results indicated that single teachers and teachers with little experience have a greater than usual tendency to leave their present schools to teach elsewhere.

Another type of teacher, which should be given particular attention, is the teacher first certified in a place other than Alberta or Saskatchewan. There was a greater tendency than average among these teachers to leave their present schools to teach elsewhere or to leave the profession entirely.

Most teachers in the study, who were leaving their present school to teach elsewhere, had only taught in that school for one year. It seems that administrators might profitably make special efforts to meet the needs of teachers who are in their first year in any given school.

The study seemed to identify a number of areas in which an administrator should concentrate his efforts when trying to deal with mobility and turnover among his staff. The first area involves salary. The higher a teacher's salary, the more likely was he to remain in his present school.

Assignment of teachers to their subject preference seemed to be predictive of teacher mobility. The better a teacher was assigned to his subject preference, the more likely was he to remain in his present school. Assignment according to the teacher's subject specialization did not seem as important as subject preference assignment.

Another area of importance to mobility, as indicated by



the study, was that of working conditions in the school. Teachers with good working conditions in their schools, as assessed by the Working Conditions Scale used in the study, were more likely to remain in their schools than were teachers with less desirable working conditions.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The findings of this study have shown that certain teacher and school characteristics appear to be related to teacher mobility. The evidence in this study also reveals the need for further research in a number of areas.

1. A study should be done on the relationships between the personalities of supervisory and administrative personnel, and the rate of teacher mobility and turnover. A few researchers believe that personal relationships between teacher and supervisor may be the most important factor in teacher mobility.

2. A more comprehensive study on working conditions and instructional load of the teachers should be attempted. Factors such as amount of responsibility delegated to the teachers, and types of pupils taught by the teachers, could be included.

3. Elementary teachers were not included in the analysis involving teacher misassignment. A similar study might be done using only elementary teachers as the sample.

4. A study is suggested which would include different types of schools and teaching techniques in order to determine how they relate to teacher mobility. Differentiated staffing, open area, traditional and continuous progress schools, to name



only a few organizational patterns, could be included as variables in such a study.

5. Factors extrinsic to the school may also be important predictors of teacher mobility. Perhaps many teachers are influenced by "non-school" variables more than by variables related directly to the school. A study involving these variables and their relationship to mobility is suggested.

6. An attempt should be made to analyze teachers' instructional load and working conditions in greater depth. Separate analyses on the individual instructional load and working conditions items might be attempted.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alberta Teachers' Association. Geographic and Occupational Mobility of Alberta Teachers. Edmonton: Barnett House, September, 1970.
- Booth, Frusanna. "Why Do Teachers Drop Out," Childhood Education, 44: 245-246, December, 1967.
- Bruce, William. "Teacher Turnover," The American School Board Journal, 149: 29, November, 1964.
- Carmack, L.V. "Teacher Turnover in the Grande Prairie Public School System." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.
- Conville, R.S. and S.A. Anderson. "Teacher Turnover in Coles County, Illinois," Educational Administration and Supervision, 42: 10-19, January, 1956.
- Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1965-1966. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, February, 1968.
- Dunn, Kenneth. "Do You Know Why Teachers Resign?" Overview, 2: 30, June, 1967.
- Erickson, E. and others. Teacher Mobility, Teacher Dropout and the Expectations of the Family and Friends, Final Report. Western Michigan University, Office of Education, March, 1968.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. second edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Fasano, James. "The Assignment and Misassignment of Intermediate Grade Teachers in Alberta." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.
- Fisher, Duane. "Reducing Teacher Turnover," Michigan Educational Record, 40: 374, January, 1963.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and B. Snyderman. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1959.
- Hill, P.W. "How to Secure and Retain Good Teachers," Educational Digest, 24: 8-10, October, 1958.



Lundrigan, J.H. "Factors Related to Inter-School Mobility Among Certified Teachers in Newfoundland." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

Miller, Elizabeth. "Teacher Dropouts," Newfoundland Teachers' Association Journal, 60: 6-7, February, 1969.

National Education Association Research Bulletin. "Teacher Mobility and Loss," 46: 118-126, December, 1968.

Newfoundland Department of Education News Letter, "Teacher Mobility," 17: 8, March, 1966.

Orlich, D.C. "Idaho Teacher Turnover, 1965 - A Selected Analysis of the Problem," The Journal of Teacher Education, 18: 477-453, Winter, 1967.

Orlich, D.C. and Craver. The Development of an Information System for Teacher Turnover in Public Schools. Idaho State University, November, 1968.

Patton, J.G. "Man Power Problems in Rural Schools," Teachers' College Record, 59: 14-19, October, 1957.

Ratsoy, E.W. Characteristics and Instructional Practices of Alberta Teachers in 1968-1969. Edmonton: Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies, 1970.

Rousseau, D.A. "The Assignment and Misassignment of Secondary School Teachers in Alberta." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Stinnett, T.M. The Teacher Dropout. Bloomington, Indiana, E.E. Peacock Inc., 1970.

Thompson, J.F. "A Look at Some Who Quit Teaching," Agricultural Education Magazine, 39: 156-158, January, 1967.

Williams, M.F. "To Attract and Hold Good Teachers," The School Executive, 79: 66-68, September, 1959.



## APPENDIX







A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 I

1. Which of the following most nearly describes the position you hold in your school system this year?

|   |                          |  |                          |   |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom teacher, giving all or nearly all of time to classroom teaching. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Vice-principal or assistant principal, teaching half time or more.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Supervisor, coordinator or consultant of a subject field, grade(s) or division(s) working in or from the district, division or county office.        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time, temporary, or substitute teacher.                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Vice-principal or assistant principal, teaching less than half time or not teaching.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Counsellor or psychologist working in or from the district, division, or county office.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Department Head, grade coordinator or consultant assigned to one school.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Principal, teaching half time or more.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Coordinator or consultant of a subject field or grade(s) assigned to two or more schools (not working from the district, division or county office). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Counsellor, teaching half time or more.                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Principal, teaching less than half time.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Counsellor, teaching less than half time or not teaching.                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Non teaching principal.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant or deputy superintendent.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Librarian, teaching half time or more.                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Director or coordinator of a special service (personnel, A/V materials, research, public relations, etc.) working in or from the district, division or county office. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Other.   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Librarian, teaching less than half time or not teaching.                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |  | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |

2. In which DIVISION(S) does your MAIN responsibility this year lie?

|  |                          |  |                          |   |
|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Primary (K to III)      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior High (X to XII)        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Junior and Senior High       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Intermediate (IV to VI) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Both Primary and Intermediate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Elementary, Jr. and Sr. High |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Junior High (VII to IX) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Elementary and Junior High    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Junior College               |

3. In which GRADE do you do MOST teaching this year?

|                                |                          |                                |                          |                                 |                          |   |                          |   |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> One   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Five  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Nine   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Kindergarten                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Equally in 2 or more Sr. High grades |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Two   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Six   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Ten    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Equally in 2 or more Elementary grades | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Junior College                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Three | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Seven | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Eleven | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Equally in 2 or more Jr. High grades   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> No regular teaching                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Four  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Eight | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Twelve | <input type="checkbox"/> |   | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |

4. How many HOURS PER WEEK do you spend IN CLASSROOM TEACHING? (Exclude time spent counselling, supervising, etc.)

|  |                          |  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 5 to 10 hours  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 to 25 hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under 2 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 10 to 15 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 25 to 30 hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 to 5 hours  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 15 to 20 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 30 hours       |

5. What is the ENROLMENT of the LARGEST CLASS that you teach? If you supervise some pupils while teaching others, consider a class to be the total number of pupils for whom you have sole charge in your room at any one time.

|                                   |                          |                                   |                          |                                   |                          |                                   |                          |  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 16 to 20 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 26 to 30 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 36 to 40 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 45                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 21 to 25 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 31 to 35 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 41 to 45 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> No regular classroom teaching |

6. What is the ENROLMENT of the MEDIAN-SIZED (Middle-sized) CLASS you teach? Class defined as in Question 5. If you teach only one class, mark same response as in Question 5.

|                                   |                          |                                   |                          |                                   |                          |                                   |                          |  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 16 to 20 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 26 to 30 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 36 to 40 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 45                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 21 to 25 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 31 to 35 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 41 to 45 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> No regular classroom teaching |

7. What is the total number of DIFFERENT PUPILS that you teach in a week?

|  |                          |  |                          |  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under 30 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 50 to 99 pupils   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 200 to 299 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> No regular teaching |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 30 to 39 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 100 to 149 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 300 to 399 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 40 to 49 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 150 to 199 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 400 or more       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |



|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |

- 8 In what TYPE OF SCHOOL do you work? For question 8 and 9 consider YOUR SCHOOL to be the organization under the direct responsibility of your Principal.

|   |  |  |   |  |       |                              |
|---|--|--|---|--|-------|------------------------------|
| Not assigned to one school (ie., work in or from central office or in several schools). |  |  | Junior High School (has some or all of Grades VII or IX but no grades below VII or above IX). |  | ..... | Elementary and Junior High   |
|   |  |  |   |  | ..... | Elementary, Jr. and Sr. High |
| Elementary (School has some or all of Grades I to VI, but no grade above VI).           |  |  | Senior High School (School has some or all of Grades X to XII but no grades below X).         |  | ..... | Junior High and Senior High  |
|   |  |  |   |  | ..... | Other                        |

- 9 How many TEACHERS (full-time equivalent) teach in the SCHOOL in which you teach? Include the principal and yourself

|                 |  |                   |  |                      |  |                                 |
|-----------------|--|-------------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 1 Teacher       |  | 9 to 12 teachers  |  | 25 to 49 teachers    |  | I am not assigned to one School |
| 2 or 3 teachers |  | 13 to 18 teachers |  | 50 to 99 teachers    |  |                                 |
| 4 to 8 teachers |  | 19 to 24 teachers |  | 100 or more teachers |  |                                 |

- 10 By what TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT are you employed? If by a Division or County, mark the first alternative. If by an Independent (Non-Divisional) District, mark an alternative other than "School Division or County".

|       |                                  |  |       |                                  |  |       |                       |
|-------|----------------------------------|--|-------|----------------------------------|--|-------|-----------------------|
| ..... | School Division or County        |  | ..... | Rural School Dist. (not RC Sep.) |  | ..... | Federal Indian School |
| ..... | City District (not RC Sep.)      |  | ..... | City District (RC Sep.)          |  | ..... | D.N.D. School         |
| ..... | Town District (not RC Sep.)      |  | ..... | Town District (RC Sep.)          |  | ..... | Private School        |
| ..... | Village District (not RC Sep.)   |  | ..... | Village or Rural Dist. (RC Sep.) |  | ..... | Other                 |
| ..... | Consolidated Dist. (not RC Sep.) |  | ..... | Regional High School District    |  |       |                       |

- 11 What is the EXTENT of your TOTAL ACADEMIC and PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL?

|  |   |  |   |  |       |   |
|--|---|--|---|--|-------|---|
|  | Less than a 1-year program (7 mos.) in a Normal School, Teachers' College or University.      |  | Three complete years but less than four in a University and/or Teachers' College. |  | ..... | Five complete years but less than six in a University and/or Teachers' College. |
|  | Standard 1-year program (7 mos. or more) in a Normal School, Teachers' College or University. |  | Four complete years but less than five in a University and/or Teachers' College.  |  | ..... | Six or more complete years in a University and/or Teachers' College.            |
|  | Two complete years but less than three in a University and/or Teachers' College.              |  |   |  |       |   |

- 12 For how many years of teacher education are you paid?

|                         |  |                         |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| 1 year but less than 2  |  | 4 years but less than 5 |  | 7 years or more  |
| 2 years but less than 3 |  | 5 years but less than 6 |  | Years of teacher education are not used to calculate my salary |
| 3 years but less than 4 |  | 6 years but less than 7 |  |  |

- 13 WHERE did you obtain your EARLIEST CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHING?

|       |                              |  |       |                                 |  |       |                             |
|-------|------------------------------|--|-------|---------------------------------|--|-------|-----------------------------|
| ..... | In Alberta                   |  | ..... | In England, Scotland or Wales   |  | ..... | In Australia or New Zealand |
| ..... | In Saskatchewan              |  | ..... | In the United States of America |  | ..... | In Asia                     |
| ..... | In another Canadian province |  | ..... | In Continental Europe           |  | ..... | Somewhere not listed here   |

- 14 What is the HIGHEST UNIVERSITY DEGREE you hold?

|           |  |                         |        |  |                              |  |                  |                |
|-----------|--|-------------------------|--------|--|------------------------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| No Degree |  | .....                   | B. Sc. |  | Two or more Bachelor degrees |  | .....            | Other Master's |
| B. Ed.    |  | Other Bachelor's Degree | M. Ed. |  | .....                        |  | Ed. D. or Ph. D. |                |
| B. A.     |  |                         |        |  | .....                        |  | Other            |                |

- 15 In what year, since starting to teach, did you last attend a university full time (winter) session?

|              |              |              |      |       |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|------|-------|
| Before 1945  | 1950 to 1954 | 1960 to 1964 | 1966 | 1968  |
| 1945 to 1949 | 1955 to 1959 | 1965         | 1967 | Never |



.....

|                     |                      |                     |                      |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 | F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 | A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 | F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 |
| A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 | F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 | A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 | F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 |
| A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 | F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 |                     | 3                    |

16. In what year, since starting to teach, did you last attend a credit course at a UNIVERSITY SUMMER SCHOOL or UNIVERSITY EVENING CREDIT PROGRAM?

|              |              |              |      |       |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|------|-------|
| Before 1945  | 1950 to 1954 | 1960 to 1964 | 1966 | 1968  |
| 1945 to 1949 | 1955 to 1959 | 1965         | 1967 | Never |

17. In what year, since starting to teach, did you LAST attend a NON-CREDIT course of at least 5 days' duration or 10 evenings or equivalent? (Include Short Course for Principals or similar non-credit summer or evening courses).

|              |              |              |      |       |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|------|-------|
| Before 1945  | 1950 to 1954 | 1960 to 1964 | 1966 | 1968  |
| 1945 to 1949 | 1955 to 1959 | 1965         | 1967 | Never |

18. For which area of specialization do you consider yourself MOST adequately prepared?

|   |                                      |                                      |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Reading                                 | Mathematics                          | Home Economics                       | Vocational Subjects (Other than Business) |
| Social Studies                          | Science                              | Libraries                            | Counselling-Psych.                        |
| English                                 | Fine Arts                            | Industrial Arts                      | Administration                            |
| French                                  | Physical Education                   | Business Education                   | Exceptional Children                      |
| Language (Other than French or English) | Teaching or supervising Grades 1-2-3 | Teaching or supervising Grades 4-5-6 | Other                                     |

19. How many university undergraduate courses (or equivalent) have you completed in your specialization marked in 18?

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |      |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 or more | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|

20. How many university graduate courses have you completed in your specialization chosen in 18?

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |      |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 or more | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|

21. Which is your second field of specialization?

|   |                                      |                                      |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Reading                                 | Mathematics                          | Home Economics                       | Vocational Subjects (Other than Business) |
| Social Studies                          | Science                              | Libraries                            | Counselling-Psych.                        |
| English                                 | Fine Arts                            | Industrial Arts                      | Administration                            |
| French                                  | Physical Education                   | Business Education                   | Exceptional Children                      |
| Language (Other than French or English) | Teaching or supervising grades 1-2-3 | Teaching or supervising grades 4-5-6 | No second field of specialization         |
|   |                                      |                                      | Other                                     |

22. How many university courses (or equivalent) have you completed in your specialization marked in 21?

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |      |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 or more | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|

23. Which field are you mainly assigned to during the PRESENT SCHOOL YEAR?

|   |                                      |                                      |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Reading                                 | Mathematics                          | Home Economics                       | Vocational Subjects (Other than Business) |
| Social Studies                          | Science                              | Libraries                            | Counselling-Psych.                        |
| English                                 | Fine Arts                            | Industrial Arts                      | Administration                            |
| French                                  | Physical Education                   | Business Education                   | Exceptional Children                      |
| Language (Other than French or English) | Teaching or supervising grades 1-2-3 | Teaching or supervising grades 4-5-6 | Other                                     |

24. What proportion of your teaching week is devoted to the field you have marked in question 23?

|               |                |                |                |                |          |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| Less than 10% | From 10 to 24% | From 25 to 49% | From 50 to 74% | From 75 to 89% | 90%+plus |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|

25. How many university courses (or equivalent) have you completed in the area of concentration marked in question 23?

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |      |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 or more | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|



|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |

26. You may be assigned to more than one field this school year. Which is your **SECOND FIELD OF CONCENTRATION**?

|   |                                      |                                      |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Reading                                 | Mathematics                          | Home Economics                       | Vocational Subjects (Other than Business) |
| Social Studies                          | Science                              | Libraries                            | Counselling-Psych                         |
| English                                 | Fine Arts                            | Industrial Arts                      | Administration                            |
| French                                  | Physical Education                   | Business Education                   | Exceptional Children                      |
| Language (Other than English or French) | Teaching or supervising grades 4-5-6 | Teaching or supervising grades 1-2-3 | No second field of concentration          |
|   |                                      |                                      | Other                                     |

27. What proportion of your teaching week is devoted to the field you have marked in Question 26?

|               |                |                |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Less than 10% | From 10 to 24% | From 25 to 49% |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|

28. How many university courses (or equivalent) have you completed in the area of concentration marked in question 26?

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |      |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 or more | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|

29. In which field would you **PREFER** to work?

|   |                                      |                                      |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Reading                                 | Mathematics                          | Home Economics                       | Vocational Subjects (Other than Business) |
| Social Studies                          | Science                              | Libraries                            | Counselling-Psych                         |
| English                                 | Fine Arts                            | Industrial Arts                      | Administration                            |
| French                                  | Physical Education                   | Business Education                   | Exceptional Children                      |
| Language (Other than English or French) | Teaching or supervising grades 4-5-6 | Teaching or supervising grades 1-2-3 | Other                                     |

30. How many university courses (or equivalent) have you completed in the field of preference marked in question 29?

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |      |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 or more | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|------|

31. How many different courses or subjects do you teach? (Elementary teachers count reading, art, etc. separately)

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |                |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 or more | none regularly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----------------|

32. Counting the present school year, what is your **TOTAL NUMBER** of **SCHOOL YEARS** of full-time experience in the field of education as a teacher, administrator, counsellor, etc.

|   |     |       |       |         |
|---|-----|-------|-------|---------|
| 1 | 3-4 | 10-14 | 20-24 | Over 34 |
| 2 | 5-9 | 15-19 | 25-34 |         |

33. Counting the present year, what is the number of years of full time experience you have had **IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM** where you are now employed?

|   |     |       |       |         |
|---|-----|-------|-------|---------|
| 1 | 3-4 | 10-14 | 20-24 | Over 34 |
| 2 | 5-9 | 15-19 | 25-34 |         |

34. Counting the present year, what is the number of years of full time experience you have had in the **SCHOOL** where you now hold a position?

|   |     |       |         |     |
|---|-----|-------|---------|-----|
| 1 | 3-4 | 10-14 | 20-24   | N/A |
| 2 | 5-9 | 15-19 | Over 24 |     |

35. Since you began teaching, in how many **DIFFERENT** school systems have you taught full time?

|   |   |   |   |   |        |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Over 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------|

36. Since you began teaching, in how many **DIFFERENT** schools have you taught full time?

|   |   |   |         |
|---|---|---|---------|
| 1 | 3 | 5 | 7-10    |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | Over 10 |



A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10 5

37. How many breaks of at least 1 school year have there been in your full-time teaching service?

|                            |                            |                            |                                 |                               |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> None |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|

38. What was the PRIMARY REASON for your most recent break in your teaching service?

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Further Study           | <input type="checkbox"/> Marriage or full-time homemaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Forced resignation from teaching |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ill Health              | <input type="checkbox"/> Maternity or child rearing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-teaching employment | <input type="checkbox"/> Husband transferred or moved     | <input type="checkbox"/> No Breaks                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Military Service        |   |   |

39. What is the TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS AWAY FROM TEACHING referred to in question 37?

|                            |                              |                                |                                  |                               |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 10-14 | <input type="checkbox"/> 20-24   | <input type="checkbox"/> None |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 | <input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 24 |                               |

40. What were you doing in MARCH, 1968?

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching in another Alberta system | <input type="checkbox"/> Working in education but not as a classroom teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Working in a position in a field outside of education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching in this system            | <input type="checkbox"/> Attending university or college                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed and seeking work                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching outside Alberta           | <input type="checkbox"/> Homemaking  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other   |

41. What were you doing in MARCH, 1967?

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching in another Alberta system | <input type="checkbox"/> Working in education but not as a classroom teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Working in a position in a field outside of education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching in this system            | <input type="checkbox"/> Attending university or college                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed and seeking work                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching outside Alberta           | <input type="checkbox"/> Homemaking  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other   |

42. What do you expect to do in the SCHOOL YEAR 1969-70?

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teach in another Alberta system | <input type="checkbox"/> Work in education but not as a classroom teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Attend university full time for further training in teaching |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teach in this system            | <input type="checkbox"/> Work in a non-teaching position                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Be a full time homemaker                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teach outside of Alberta        | <input type="checkbox"/> Study full time in a field outside of teaching   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other  |

43. Do you plan to REMAIN in the field of education until retirement?

|                              |   |   |                             |
|------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided, probably will | <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided, probably will not | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|

44. Does your school have full or part time clerical personnel (typist, filing clerk, etc.)?

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on a full-time basis and available to assist me     | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on a part-time basis and available to assist me     | <input type="checkbox"/> I am not assigned to one school or question does not apply |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on a full-time basis but not available to assist me | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on a part-time basis but not available to assist me | <input type="checkbox"/> No   |

45. What was your average use of clerical personnel in your school since September 1, 1968?

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 hr/wk | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 hrs/wk  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 hrs/wk | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 40 hrs/wk |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or 2 hrs/wk     | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 hrs/wk | <input type="checkbox"/> 21 to 40 hrs/wk | <input type="checkbox"/> None or N/A    |

46. What was your average use of teacher aides (non-certificated teachers' assistants other than clerical assistants) since September 1, 1968?

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None in this school | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or 2 hrs/wk  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 hrs/wk | <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher aides are in the school but not available to assist me |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 hr/wk   | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 hrs/wk  | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 hrs/wk  | <input type="checkbox"/> Question does not apply  |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 hrs/wk |  |   |



A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5

F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10

A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5  
 A 1 B 2 C 3 D 4 E 5

F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 F 6 G 7 H 8 I 9 J 10  
 6

47. What was the extent, since September 1, 1968, of your use of consultative or advisory personnel who "specialize" in the subject(s) you teach?

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do no regular teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Available, not used | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None available           | <input type="checkbox"/> Once or twice       | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 times | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 times  |

48. How many student referrals were made by you to the counsellor or guidance officer since September 1, 1968?

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do no regular teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Available, no referrals | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 referrals  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 referrals |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None available           | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or 2 referrals        | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 referrals | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 referrals  |

49. To what extent did you use ability grouping as initiated by yourself since September 1, 1968?

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do no regular teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Five or fewer times | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 times to $\frac{1}{4}$ time             | <input type="checkbox"/> $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No grouping used         | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 times       | <input type="checkbox"/> $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the time | <input type="checkbox"/> Over $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time             |

50. How often since September 1, 1968, did you use small groups in your teaching (other than ability grouping)?

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do no regular teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Once or twice | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None                     | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 times |  |

51. How often since September 1, 1968, did your students engage in projects of their own choosing during class time?

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do no regular teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Once or twice | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None                     | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 times |  |

52. What proportion of teaching time did you devote to team teaching (i.e., joint planning and instruction of two or more regular-sized classes of students) since September 1, 1968?

|   |  |                                    |                                    |
|---|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do no regular teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 10% | <input type="checkbox"/> 26 to 50% | <input type="checkbox"/> 76 to 95% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No involvement           | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 25%     | <input type="checkbox"/> 51 to 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> Full time |

53. Does your school have a library available to an entire class during regular class time?

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, with a librarian who spends considerably more than half time in the library | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, with a part-time librarian who spends about half time in the library | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, with a part-time librarian who spends one-quarter time or less in the library |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, but with no person designated as librarian                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Question does not apply   | <input type="checkbox"/> No   |

54. How many times, since September 1, 1968, have you arranged for your class(es) to use the library during the school day as part of classroom activity?

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Question does not apply | <input type="checkbox"/> Once or twice | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Did not use             | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 times |  |

55. How many times, since September 1, 1968, have you scheduled class activities in the material resources centre (other than the library)?

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Question does not apply | <input type="checkbox"/> No resources centre | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Did not use             | <input type="checkbox"/> Once or twice       | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 times | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 20 times  |

56. Please indicate your SEX.

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Male | <input type="checkbox"/> Female |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

57. Please indicate your MARITAL STATUS.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Married                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed, divorced, or separated | <input type="checkbox"/> Member of an R C religious order |

58. Annual salary (before deductions) in effect in September.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under \$2,000       | <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 to \$12,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 to \$4,000  | <input type="checkbox"/> \$12,001 to \$14,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$4,001 to \$6,000  | <input type="checkbox"/> \$14,001 to \$16,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$6,001 to \$8,000  | <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$16,000        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$8,001 to \$10,000 |   |

59. What is your AGE (nearest birthday)?

|                                   |                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under 21 | <input type="checkbox"/> 31 to 35 | <input type="checkbox"/> 46 to 55 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21 to 25 | <input type="checkbox"/> 36 to 40 | <input type="checkbox"/> 56 to 65 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 26 to 30 | <input type="checkbox"/> 41 to 45 | <input type="checkbox"/> Over 65  |













**B30001**